A WORKSHOP ON TRANSLATION THEORY

TRANSLATION THEORY: OBJECT AND OBJECTIVES

Basic Assumptions

Translation is a means of interlingual communication. The translator makes possible an exchange of information between the users of different languages by producing in the target language (TL or the translating language) a text which has an identical communicative value with the source (or original) text (ST). This target text (TT, that is the translation) is not fully identical with ST as to its form or content due to the limitations imposed by the formal and semantic differences between the source language (SL) and TL. Nevertheless the users of TT identify it, to all intents and purposes, with ST – functionally, structurally and semantically. The *functional* identification is revealed in the fact that the users (or the translation receptors – TR) handle TT in such a way as if it were ST, a creation of the source text author. The translation is published, quoted, criticized, etc. as if it really belonged to the foreign Source. A Britisher may find in his paper the phrase "The French President made the following statement yesterday" and then read the statement in quotation marks. He is sure that he has read what the French President really said, which is certainly not true to fact since the President spoke French and what is cited in the paper is not the original text but something different: an English text produced by some obscure translator who blandly passes his statement for the French statesman's.

A book in Russian may bear the title: "Ч. Диккенс. Тяжелые времена" and the readers are convinced that they are reading a novel by Ch. Dickens no matter how close it actually is to the original text. They may make judgements on its merits, say, "I like Dickens" or "Dickens's style is somewhat artificial" or 'Dickens's vocabulary is very rich", etc. as if they have really had access to the author's work.

The functional status of a translation is supported by its structural and semantic similarity with the original. The translator is expected to refrain from any remarks or intrusions in his text which may betray his authorship thereof. He is expected to efface himself as fully as he can to avoid interference with the process of communication between S and TR.

The *structure* of the translation should follow that of the original text: there should be no change in the sequence of narration or in the arrangement of the segments of the text.

The aim is maximum parallelism of structure which would make it possible to relate each segment of the translation to the respective part of the original. It is presumed that any breach of parallelism is not arbitrary but dictated by the need for precision in conveying the meaning of the original. The translator is allowed to resort to a description or interpretation, only in case "direct translation" is impossible.

Structural parallelism makes it possible to compare respective units in the original text and in the translation so as to discover elements which have equivalents and those which have not, elements which have been added or omitted in translation, etc. In other words, similarity in structure is preserved in respect to the smallest segments of the text.

Of major importance is the *semantic* identification of the translation with ST. It is presumed that the translation has the same meaning as the original text. No exchange of information is possible if there is discrepancy between the transmitted and the received message. The presumption of semantic identity between ST and TT is based on the various degrees of equivalence of their meanings. The translator usually tries to produce in TL the closest possible equivalent to ST.

As a kind of practical activities translation (or the practice of translation) is a set of actions performed by the translator while rendering ST into another language. These actions are largely intuitive and the best results are naturally achieved by translators who are best suited for the job, who are well-trained or have a special aptitude, a talent for it. Masterpieces in translation are created by the past masters of the art, true artists in their profession. At its best translation is an art, a creation of a talented, high-skilled professional.

As any observable phenomenon, translation can be the object of scientific study aimed at understanding its nature, its components and their interaction as well as various factors influencing it or linked with it in a meaningful way. The science of translation or translatology is concerned both with theoretical and applied aspects of translation studies. A theoretical description of the translation phenomenon is the task of the theory of translation. Theoretical research is to discover what translation is, to find out what objective factors underlie the translator's intuition, to describe the ways and methods by which the identity of the communicative value of ST and TT is achieved. The objective knowledge obtained can then be used to help the translator to improve his performance as well as to train future translators.

The theory of translation provides the translator with the appropriate tools of analysis and synthesis, makes him aware of what he is to look for in the original text, what type of information he must convey in TT and how he should act to achieve his goal. In the final analysis, however, his trade remains an art. For science gives the translator the tools, but it takes brains, intuition and talent to handle the tools with great proficiency. Translation is a complicated phenomenon involving linguistic, psychological, cultural, literary, ergonomical and other factors. Different aspects of translation can be studied with the methods of the respective sciences. Up to date most of theoretical research of translation has been done within the framework of linguistics. The linguistic theory of translation is concerned with translation as a form of speech communication establishing contact between communicants who speak different languages. The basis of this theory is linguistics in the broadest sense of the word, that is, macrolinguistics with all its new branches, such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, text linguistics, communicative linguistics, etc., studying the language structure and its functioning in speech in their relationship to mind, culture and society. Language, which makes possible communication between people, is part of all human activities, of life itself.

The core of the translation theory is the general theory of translation which is concerned with the fundamental aspects of translation inherent in the nature of bilingual communication and therefore common to all translation events, irrespective of what languages are involved or what kind of text and under what circumstances was translated. Basically, replacement of ST by TT of the same communicative value is possible because both texts are produced in human speech governed by the same rules and implying the same relationships between language, reality and the human mind. All languages are means of communication, each language is used to externalize and shape human thinking, all language units are meaningful entities related to non-linguistic realities, all speech units convey information to the communicants. In any language communication is made possible through a complicated logical interpretation by the users of the speech units, involving an assessment of the meaning of the language signs against the information derived from the contextual situation, general knowledge, previous experience, various associations and other factors. The general theory of translation deals, so to speak, with translation universals and is the basis for all other theoretical study in this area, since it describes what translation is and what makes it possible.

An important part of the general theory of translation is the theory of equivalence aimed at studying semantic relationships between ST and TT. It has been noted that there is a presumption of semantic identity between the translation and its source text. At the same time it is easily demonstrable that there is, in fact, no such identity for even a cursory examination of any translation reveals inevitable losses, increments or changes of the information transmitted. Let us take an elementary example. Suppose we have an English sentence "The student is reading a book". Its Russian translation will be "Студент читает книгу". This translation is a good equivalent of the English sentence, but it is not identical in meaning. It can be pointed out, for example, that the Russian sentence leaves out the meaning of the articles as well as the specific meaning of the Continuous Tense. In Russian we do not get explicit information that it is some definite student but not some particular book or that the reading is in progress at the moment of speech. On the other hand, the Russian sentence conveys some additional information which is absent in the source text. We learn from it that the student is a male, while in ST it may just as well be a female. Then the translation implies that the student in the case is a college undergraduate, while in ST he may be a high school student or even a scholar, to say nothing of the additional grammatical meaning conveyed by the grammatical aspect of "читает", the gender of "книга" and so on. Part of this information, lost or added in the translating process, may be irrelevant for communication, another part is supplemented or neutralized by the contextual situation, but it is obvious that translation equivalence does not imply an absolute semantic identity of the two texts. The theory of equivalence is concerned with factors which prevent such an identity, it strives to discover how close ST and TT can be and how close they are in each particular case.

The general theory of translation describes the basic principles which hold good for each and every translation event. In each particular case, however, the translating process is influenced both by the common basic factors and by a number of specific variables which stem from the actual conditions and modes of the translator's work: the type of original texts he has to cope with, the form in which ST is presented to him and the form in which he is supposed to submit his translation, the specific requirements he may be called upon to meet in his work, etc.

Contemporary translation activities are characterized by a great variety of types, forms and levels of responsibility. The translator has to deal with works of the great authors of the past and of the leading authors of today, with intricacies of science fiction and the accepted stereotypes of detective stories. He must be able to cope with the elegancy of expression of the best masters of literary style and with the tricks and formalistic experiments of modern avant-gardists. The translator has to preserve and fit into a different linguistic and social context a gamut of shades of meaning and stylistic nuances expressed in the original text by a great variety of language devices:

neutral and emotional words, archaic words and new coinages, metaphors and similes, foreign borrowings, dialectal, jargon and slang expressions, stilted phrases and obscenities, proverbs and quotations, illiterate or inaccurate speech, and so on and so forth.

The original text may deal with any subject from general philosophical principles or postulates to minute technicalities in some obscure field of human endeavour. The translator has to tackle complicated specialized descriptions and reports on new discoveries in science or technology for which appropriate terms have not yet been invented. His duty is to translate diplomatic representations and policy statements, scientific dissertations and brilliant satires, maintenance instructions and after-dinner speeches, etc.

Translating a play the translator must bear in mind the requirements of theatrical presentation, and dubbing a film he must see to it that his translation fits the movement of the speakers' lips.

The translator may be called upon to make his translation in the shortest possible time, while taking a meal or against the background noise of loud voices or rattling type-writers.

In simultaneous interpretation the translator is expected to keep pace with the fastest speakers, to understand all kinds of foreign accents and defective pronunciation, to guess what the speaker meant to say but failed to express due to his inadequate proficiency in the language he speaks.

In consecutive interpretation he is expected to listen to long speeches, taking the necessary notes, and then to produce his translation in full or compressed form, giving all the details or only the main ideas.

In some cases the users will be satisfied even with the most general idea of the meaning of the original, in other cases the translator may be taken to task for the slightest omission or minor error.

Each type of translation has its own combination of factors influencing the translating process. The general theory of translation should be supplemented by a number of special translation theories identifying major types of translation activities and describing the predominant features of each type.

Another important branch of the theory of translation is concerned with the study of ST and TT units which can replace each other in the translating process. The creation of equivalent texts results in, and in part is dependent on, the equivalence of correlated language units in the two texts. In any two languages there are pairs of units which are of identical or similar communicative value and can replace each other in translation. The communicative value of a language element depends both on its own semantics and on the way it is used in speech. Therefore translation equivalence may be established between units occupying dissimilar places in the system of respective languages. It follows that equivalent units cannot be discovered with confidence before a certain amount of TT's have been compared with their ST's.

It is obvious that a description of translation equivalents, as opposed to the methods of the general theory of translation, should be bilingual, that is, it should always relate to a definite pair of languages. Moreover, a bilingual theory of translation should study two separate sets of equivalents, with either language considered, in turn, as SL and the other as TL. Nevertheless all bilingual theories of translation proceed from the identical basic assumptions as to the classification of equivalents and their role in the translating process.

Of particular interest is that branch of the theory of translation which is concerned with the translating process itself, that is, with the operations required for passing over from ST to TT. It is a great challenge to the translation theory to discover how the translator does the trick, what are his mental processes which ensure production in TL of a text of identical communicative value with the given ST. True, these processes are not directly observable but they can be studied, even though with a certain degree of approximation, in various indirect ways. This direction of the translation theory is of considerable practical value for it makes possible the description of particular methods of translation that can be used by the translator to ensure equivalence between ST and TT. The study of the translating process reveals both the translator's general strategy and specific techniques used to solve typical translation problems.

In conclusion, mention should be made of one more branch of the theory of translation which deals with the pragmatic aspects of the translating process. The communicants involved in interlingual communication speak different languages but they also belong to different cultures, have different general knowledge, different social and historical background. This fact has a considerable impact on the translator's strategy since the most truthful rendering of ST contents may sometimes be partially or fully misunderstood by the receptors of the translation or fail to produce a similar effect upon them. The translator has to assess the possible communicative effect of TT and take pains to ensure an adequate understanding of its message by TR. This may necessitate expanding or modifying the original message to make it more meaningful to the members of a different language community.

A further pragmatic adaptation may be imperative if TT is addressed to some specific social or professional group of people or if the translation event has some additional pragmatic purpose. In some cases the pragmatic value of translation is the major factor in assessing the quality of the translator's performance.

All branches of the theory of translation are concerned with important aspects of the translator's work and constitute a body of theoretical thought of indisputable practical value.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What is translation? What is interlingual communication? How can it be demonstrated that TT has an identical communicative value with ST? In what respect do the TT users identify it with ST?

2. What is the practice of translation? What is the art of translation? What is translatology? What is the aim of the theory of translation? In what way can the theory of translation be useful to the translator?

3. What aspects of translation may be the object of study of different sciences? Which science plays a leading role in translation studies today? How can linguistic research be classified? What kind of linguistics can be the basis of the theory of translation?

4. What is the field of the general theory of translation? What common properties of all languages make translation possible? Can two texts in different languages be absolutely identical semantically? What is translation equivalence?

5. In what way do translation events differ from one another? Does the translating process depend on the type of the source text? In what form can a translation be made?

What are special theories of translation concerned with?

6. Are the relationships of equivalence established only between ST and TT as a whole or also between correlated language units in these texts? What is a translation equivalent? Should translation equivalents be studied on a bilingual or a multilingual basis?

7. What is the translating process? Is the translating process directly observable? Can the result of the translating process (TT) give some information about the process itself? What is the practical aspect of studying the translating process?

8. What are the pragmatic aspects of translation? Why might one and the same message be understood in a different way by SR and TR? How can pragmatic considerations influence the translating process?

EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION

Basic Assumptions

This lecture deals with the problems of translation equivalence which is defined as a measure of semantic similarity between ST and TT.

If we compare a number of TTs with their STs we shall discover that the degree of semantic similarity between the two texts involved in the translating process may vary. In other words the equivalence between ST and TT may be based on the reproduction of different parts of the ST contents. Accordingly, several types of translation equivalence can be distinguished.

Let us first of all single out translations in which the degree of semantic similarity with ST seems to be the lowest. This type of equivalence can be illustrated by the following examples (cited from the published translations):

(1) Maybe there is some chemistry between us that doesn't mix. Бывает, что люди не сходятся характерами.

(2) A rolling stone gathers no moss. Кому дома не сидится, тот добра не наживет.

(3) That's a pretty thing to say. Постыдился бы!

Here we cannot discover any common semes or invariant structures in the original and its translation. An absolute dissimilarity of language units is accompanied by the absence of obvious logical link between the two messages which could lead to the conclusion that they are "about the same thing", i.e. that they describe one and the same situation. Yet, it is evident that the two sentences have something in common as to their meaning. This common part of their contents is obviously of great importance, since it is enough to ensure an adequate communication.

Moreover, it comprises the information which must be preserved by all means even though the greater part of the contents of the original is lost in the translation.

From the examples we can see that common to the original and its translation in each case is only the general intent of the message, the implied or figurative sense, in other words, the conclusions the Receptor can draw from the total contents or the associations they can evoke in him, or the special emphasis on some aspect of communication. In plain English, the translation does not convey either "'what the original text is about", or "what is said in if or "how it is said", but only "what it is said for", i.e. what the Source meant, what the aim of the message is.

This part of the contents which contains information about the general intent of the message, its orientation towards a certain communicative effect can be called "the purport of communication". Thus we can deduce that in the *first type* of equivalence it is only the purport of communication that is retained in translation. The second group of translations can be illustrated by the following examples:

He answered the telephone. Он снял трубку.

You see one bear, you have seen them all. Все медведи похожи друг на друга.

It was late in the day. Близился вечер.

This group of examples is similar to the first one, as the equivalence of translations here does not involve any parallelism of lexical or structural units. Most of the words or syntactical structures of the original have no direct correspondences in the translation. At the same time it is obvious that there is a greater proximity of contents than in the preceding group. Besides the purport of communication there is some additional information contained in the original that is retained. This fact can be easily proved if we compare the examples of the two groups. Consider, for instance, the translations:

(1) Maybe there is some chemistry between us that doesn't mix. Бывает, что люди не сходятся характерами.

(2) He answered the telephone. Он снял трубку.

In (1) the things referred to are different, so that there is hardly any logical connection between the two statements. The similarity of the original and the translation is restricted to the fact that in both cases we can draw identical conclusions about the speaker's sentiments: there is no love lost between him and another person.

In (2) the incomparable language units in the original and in the translation describe, in fact, the same action, refer to identical reality, as a telephone call cannot be answered unless one picks up the receiver. Both texts give different information about the same, or, as one sometimes says, they express the same idea "using different words". It is the type of equivalence that can be well explained in terms of the situational theory. We may presume that such phrases describe identical situations but each is presented in a different way. Thus in this group of translations the equivalence implies retention of two types of information contained in the original – the purport of communication and the indication of the situation. Since in each of the two texts the situation is described in a different way, the common feature is not the method of description but the reference to the situation, the possibility of identifying the situation, no matter how it is described in the text. The information which characterized the *second type* of equivalence can, therefore, be designated as "identification of the situation".

In the next group of translations the part of the contents which is to be retained is still larger. This type of equivalence can be exemplified as follows:

Scrubbing makes me bad-tempered.От мытья полов у меня настроение портится.

London saw a cold winter last year. В прошлом году зима в Лондоне была холодной.

You are not serious? Вы шутите?

In this case the translation retains the two preceding informative complexes as well as the method of describing the situation. In other words, it contains the same general notions as the original. This means that the translation is a semantic paraphrase of the original, preserving its basic semes and allowing their free reshuffle in the sentence. Thus we are faced with a situation that can be explained in terms of the semantic theory. The common semes are easily discovered in the comparative analysis of the translations of this group. Consider the first of the examples cited. Both in the translation and in the original the situation is described as a "cause-effect" event with a different pattern of identical semes. In the original: A (scrubbing) causes B (I) to have C (temper) characterized by the property D (bad). In the translation: C (temper) belonging to B (I) acquires the property D (bad) because of A (scrubbing).

The use of the identical notions in the two texts means that the basic structure of the messages they convey remains intact. If in the previous types of equivalence the translation gave the information of "what the original message is for" and '"what it is about", here it also indicates '"what is said in the original", i.e. what aspect of the described situation is mentioned in the communication.

We can now say that the *third type* of equivalence exemplified by the translations of the third group, implies retention in the translation of the three parts of the original contents which we have conventionally designated as the purport of communication, the identification of the situation and the method of its description.

The fourth group of translations can be illustrated by the following examples:

He was never tired of old songs. Старые песни ему никогда не надоедали.

I don't see **that I need** to convince you. **Не вижу надобности** доказывать это вам.

He was standing with his arms crossed and his bare head bent. Он стоял, **сложив руки на груди и опустив непокрытую голову.**

In this group the semantic similarity of the previous types of equivalence is reinforced by the invariant meaning of the syntactic structures in the original and the translation. In such translations the syntactic structures can be regarded as derived from those in the original through direct or backward transformations. This includes cases when the translation makes use of similar or parallel structures.

An important feature of this and the subsequent type of equivalence is that they imply the retention of the linguistic meaning, i.e. the information fixed in the substantial or structural elements of language as their plane of content. We can say that here the translation conveys not only the '"what for", the '"what about" and the '"what" of the original but also something of the "how-it-is-said in the original". The meaning of language units is an important part of the overall contents of the text and the translator strives to preserve it in his translation as best he can.

Thus, the *fourth type* of equivalence presupposes retention in the translation of the four meaningful components of the original: the purport of communication, the identification of the situation, the method of its description, and the invariant meaning of the syntactic structures.

Last but not least, comes the *fifth group* of translations that can be discovered when we analyse their relationships with the respective originals. Here we find the maximum possible semantic similarity between texts in different languages. These translations try to retain the meaning of all the words used in the original text. The examples cited below illustrate this considerable semantic proximity of the correlated words in the two sentences:

I saw him at the theatre. Я видел его в театре.

The house was sold for 10 thousand dollars. Дом был продан за десять тысяч долларов.

The Organisation is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. Организация основана на принципе суверенного равенства всех ее членов.

Here we can observe the equivalence of semes which make up the meaning of correlated words in the original text and the translation; parallelism of syntactic structures implying the maximum invariance of their meanings; the similarity of the national categories which determine the method of describing the situation; the identity of the situations; the identical functional aim of the utterance or the purport of communication. The relative identity of the contents of the two texts depends in this case on the extent to which various components of the word meaning can be rendered in translation without detriment to the retention of the rest of the information contained in the original.

Now we can sum up our findings. We have discovered that there are five different types of semantic relationships between equivalent phrases (texts) in two languages. Thus all translations can be classified into five types of equivalence which differ as to the volume and character of the information retained in each. Each subsequent type of equivalence retains the part of the original contents which includes the information preserved in the previous types.

Every translation can be regarded as belonging to a certain type of equivalence. Since each subsequent type implies a higher degree of semantic similarity we can say that every translation is made at a certain level of equivalence.

Each level of equivalence is characterized by the part of information the retention of which distinguishes it from the previous level. The list of levels, therefore, includes: 1) the level of the purport of communication; 2) the level of (the identification of) the situation; 3) the level of the method of description (of the situation); 4) the level of syntactic meanings; 5) the level of word semantics.

It is worth noting that the information characterizing different levels is inherent to any unit of speech. Indeed, a unit of speech always has some communicative intent, denotes a certain situation, possesses a certain notional structure, and is produced as a syntactically patterned string of words.

Thus, a translation event is accomplished at a definite level of equivalence. It should be emphasized that the level hierarchy does not imply the idea of approbation or disapprobation. A translation can be good at any level of equivalence.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What is translation equivalence? Is every translation equally dose semantically to its ST? How can different types of equivalence be singled out? In what way does one type of equivalence differ from the other?

2. What is the minimum semantic similarity between ST and TT? How can the first type of translation equivalence be defined? What is the purport of communication? Should the purport of communication be always preserved in translation?

3. How can the second type of equivalence be characterized? In what way does it differ from the first type? How can a situation be described in the text? Do the methods used to describe the situation in ST and TT remain the same in the second type of equivalence?

What is situational equivalence?

4. What parts of the ST contents are retained in the third type of equivalence? How can the identity of the methods of describing the situation be demonstrated in such cases? What semantic variations can be observed in translations of this type?

5. What is the role of the meaning of the language units which make up the text? What is the fourth type of equivalence? In what way can the meaning of the ST syntactical structures be preserved in translation?

6. How can the fifth type of equivalence be defined? What are the main components of the word semantics? Is the whole meaning of the word actualized when the word is used in the text? Can words of different languages be identical in their meaning?

7. What levels of equivalence can be distinguished in translation? How do the equivalence levels mirror the essential features of speech units?

8. What level of equivalence can the translator reach in the translating process? Is it always necessary or possible to translate at the same level of equivalence? What factors does the choice depend on?

Text

CONSERVATION AND POLITICIANS

Conservation and ecology are suddenly fashionable. Politicians on both sides of the Atlantic are seizing on "the environment as a topical political issue. It seems, however, that they are in danger of missing the point. Protecting our environment cannot be achieved simply by some magic new technology; nor by tinkering with our present system. Saving the environment raises profound questions about some of fundamental assumptions of any society. It is doubtful whether some of the politicians now climbing on the conservation bandwagon fully realise this point, or whether they would be so enthusiastic if they did. Serious environmental conservation means that governments will have to set pollution standards, despite cries from the offending industries that their foreign competitors will benefit. Politicians will have to face up to some extremely awkward decisions: for instance, whether to ban cars without anti-pollution devices. There will have to be international agreements in which short-term national interests have to be sacrificed. It means, in short, a more responsible view of man's relationship to his habitat.

TYPES OF QUIVALENTS

Basic Assumptions

The structural similarity of ST and TT implies that relationships of equivalence are established between correlated units in the two texts. TL units in TT that are used to render the meaning of the respective SL units in ST can be said to substitute for the latter as their functional equivalents (or correspondences). Since language units are often used in their accepted meanings many SL units have regular equivalents in TL which arc used in numerous TT as substitutes to those units.

Some of the SL units have permanent equivalents in TL, that is to say, there is a one-to-one correspondence between such units and their equivalents. Thus "London" is always rendered into Russian as "Лондон", "a machine-gun" as "пулемет" and "hydrogen" as "водород". As a rule this type of correspondence is found with words of specific character, such as scientific and technical terms, proper or geographical names and similar words whose meaning is more or less independent of the particular contextual situation.

Other SL units may have several equivalents each. Such one-to-many correspondence between SL and TL units is characteristic of most regular equivalents. The existence of a number of non-permanent (or variable) equivalents to a SL units implies the necessity of selecting one of them in each particular case, taking into account the way the unit is used in ST and the points of difference between the semantics of its equivalents in TL.

Depending on the type of the language units involved regular equivalents can be classified as *lexical, phraseological or grammatical*.

Coordinated words in two languages may correspond to each other in one or several components of their semantic structures, while not fully identical in their semantics. The choice of the equivalent will depend on the relative importance of a particular semantic element in the act of communication. For instance, the English word "ambitious" may denote either praiseworthy or inordinate desires. Its translation will depend on which of these aspects comes to the fore. Thus "the ambitious plans of the would-bc world conquerors" will be translated as "честолюбивые планы претендентов на роль завоевателей всего мира", while 'the ambitious goals set by the United Nations" will give "грандиозные цели, поставленные ООН" in the Russian translation.

A variety of equivalents may also result from a more detailed description of the same object in TL. The English word "attitude", for instance, is translated as "отношение, позиция, политика" depending on the variant the Russian language prefers in a particular situation. Here the choice between equivalents is determined by TL factors.

Even if a SL unit has a regular equivalent in TL, this equivalent cannot be used in TT whenever the unit is found in ST. An equivalent is but a potential substitute, for the translator's choice is, to a large extent, dependent on the context in which the SL unit is placed in ST. There are two types of context: linguistic and situational. The linguistic context is made up by the other SL units in ST while the situational context includes the temporal, spacial and other circumstances under which ST was produced as well as all facts which the receptor is expected to know so that he could adequately interpret the message.

It is only by assessing the meanings of SL units in ST against the linguistic and situational contexts that the translator can discover what they mean in the particular case and what equivalents should be chosen as their substitutes. Thus in the following sentences the linguistic context will enable the translator to make a correct choice among the Russian equivalents to the English noun "attitude":

(1) I don't like your attitude to your work.
(2) There is no sign of any change in the attitudes of the two sides.
(3) He stood there in a threatening attitude.

It is obvious that in the first sentence it should be the Russian "отношение (к работе)", in the second sentence – "позиции (обеих сторон)", and in the third sentence – "поза (угрожающая)".

As often as not the correct substitute cannot be chosen unless the situational context is brought into play. If somebody is referred to in ST as "an abolitionist" the choice of the substitute will depend on the period described. In different historical periods abolitionists were people who sought the abolition of slavery, prohibition laws or death penalty. Accordingly, in the Russian translation the person will be described as "аболиционист", "сторонник отмены "сухого закона", или "сторонник отмены смертной казни".

The fact that a SL unit has a number of regular equivalents does not necessarily mean that one of them will be used in each particular translation. True, in many cases the translators skill is well demonstrated in his ability to make a good choice among such equivalents. But not infrequently the context does not allow the translator to employ any of the regular equivalents to the given SL unit. Then the translator has to look for an ad hoc way of translation which will successfully render the meaning of the unit in this particular case. Such an exceptional translation of a SL unit which suits a particular context can be described as an occasional equivalent or a contextual substitute. It is clear, for instance, that none of the above-mentioned regular equivalents to the English "attitude" can be used in the translation of the following sentence:

He has a friendly attitude towards all.

An occasional equivalent may be found through a change of the part of speech: Он ко всем относится по-дружески.

The particular contextual situation may force the translator to give up even a permanent equivalent. Geographical names have such equivalents which are formed by imitation of the foreign name in TL. And the name of the American town of New Haven (Conn.) is invariably rendered into Russian as "Нью-Хейвен". But the sentence "I graduated from New Haven in 1915" will be hardly translated in the regular way since the Russian reader may not know that New Haven is famous for its Yale university. The translator will rather opt for the occasional equivalent: "Я окончил Йельский университет в 1915 году".

The regular equivalents are by no means mechanical substitutes and their use or replacement by occasional equivalents calls for a high level of the translator's skill and taste.

The same goes for phraseological equivalents. Phraseological units or idioms may also have permanent or variable equivalents. Such English idioms as "the game is not worth the candle" or "to pull chestnuts out of the fire for smb." are usually translated by the Russian idioms "игра не стоит свеч" and "таскать каштаны из огня для кого-л.", respectively. These equivalents reproduce all the aspects of the English idioms semantics and can be used in most contexts. Other permanent equivalents, though identical in their figurative meaning, are based on different images, that is, they have different literal meaning. Cf. "to get up on the wrong side of the bed" – "встать с левой ноги", "make hay while the sun shines" – "куй железо, пока горячо". Now an English idiom may have several Russian equivalents among which the translator has to make his choice in each particular case. For instance, the meaning of the English "Do in Rome as the Romans do" may be rendered in some contexts as "С волками жить – по-волчьи выть", and in other contexts as "В чужой монастырь со своим уставом не ходят". But here, again, the translator may not infrequently prefer an occasional equivalent which can be formed by a word-for-word reproduction of the original unit: "В Риме поступай так, как римляне".

The choice of grammatical units in TT largely depends on the semantics and combinability of its lexical elements. Therefore there are practically no permanent grammatical equivalents. The variable equivalents in the field of grammar may be analogous forms in TL or different forms with a similar meaning. As often as not such equivalents are interchangeable and the translator has a free choice between them. In the following English sentence "He was a guest of honour at a reception given by the Ukrainian government" both the Russian participle "устроенном" and the attributive clause "который был устроен" can be substituted for the English participle "given". And the use of occasional equivalents is here more common than in the case of the lexical or phraseological units. We have seen that in the first three types of equivalence no equivalents to the grammatical units are deliberately selected in TL.

Semantic dissimilarity of analogous structures in SL and TL also result in SL structures having several equivalents in TL. For instance, attributive groups are common both in English and in Russian: "a green tree" – "зеленое дерево". But the semantic relationships between the numbers of the group are broader in English, which often precludes a blue-print translation of the group into Russian. As often as not the English attributive group is used to convey various adverbial ideas of location, purpose, cause, etc. Consider such groups as "Madrid trial" (location), "profits drive" (purpose), "war suffering" (cause). Such groups may also express various action-object relationships. Cf. "labour movement" (movement by the workers), "labour raids" (raids against the workers), and "labour spies" (spies among the workers).

A word within an attributive group may sometimes alter its meaning. So, "war rehabilitation" is, in fact, rehabilitation of economy after the war, that is, "post-war rehabilitation" and "Communist trials in USA" are "trials of Communists" or "anti-Communist trials".

As a result, many attributive groups are polysemantic and are translated in a different way in different contexts. "War prosperity" may mean "prosperity during the war" or "prosperity in the post-war period caused by the war". "The Berlin proposals" may imply "proposals made in Berlin" (say, at an international conference), "proposals made by Berlin" (i.e. by the GDR), "proposal on Berlin" (of political, economic or other nature).

No small number of SL units have no regular equivalents in TL. Equivalent-lacking words are often found among SL names of specific national phenomena, such as the English words "coroner, condominium, impeachment, baby-sitter" and the like. However, there are quite a number of "ordinary" words for which TL may have no equivalent lexical units: "fluid, bidder, qualifier, conservationist", etc. Some grammar forms and categories may also be equivalent-lacking. (Cf. the English gerund, article or absolute participle construction which have no counterparts in Russian.)

The absence of regular equivalents does not imply that the meaning of an equivalent-lacking SL unit cannot be rendered in translation or that its translation must be less accurate. We have seen that words with regular equivalents are not infrequently translated with the help of contextual substitutes. Similarly, the translator, coming across an equivalent-lacking word, resorts to occasional equivalents which can be created in one of the following ways:

1. Using loan-words imitating in TL the form of the SL word or word combination, e.g. tribalism – трайбализм, impeachment – "импичмент", backbencher – "заднескамеечник", brain-drain – "утечка мозгов". As often as not such occasional formations are adopted by the members of the TL community and get the status of regular

equivalents.

2. Using approximate substitutes, that is TL words with similar meaning which is extended to convey additional information (if necessary, with the help of foot-notes), e.g. drugstore – "аптека", witchhunter – мракобес, afternoon – вечер. The Russian "аптека" is not exactly a drugstore where they also sell such items as magazines, soft drinks, ice-cream, etc., but in some cases this approximate equivalent can well be used.

3. Using all kinds of lexical (semantic) transformations modifying the meaning of the SL word, e.g. "He died of exposure" may be rendered into Russian as "Он умер от простуды" or "Он погиб от солнечного удара".

4. Using an explanation to convey the meaning of the SL unit, e.g. landslide – победа на выборах подавляющим большинством голосов, brinkmanship – искусство проведения политики на грани войны, etc.

This method is sometimes used in conjunction with the first one when the introduction of a loan-word is followed by a foot-note explaining the meaning of the equivalent-lacking word in ST. After that the translator may freely employ the newly-coined substitute.

There are also quite a number of equivalent-lacking idioms. Such English phraseological units as "You cannot eat your cake and have it", "to dine with Duke Humphrey", "to send smb. to Coventry" and many others have no regular equivalents in Russian. They are translated either by reproducing their form in TL through a word-for-word translation or by explaining the figurative meaning of the idiom, e.g.: People who live in glass should not throw stones. Люди, живущие в стеклянных домах, не должны бросать камни; to see eye-to-eye with smb. – придерживаться одних взглядов.

Equivalent-lacking grammatical forms give less trouble to the translator. Here occasional substitutes can be classified under three main headings, namely:

1. Zero translations when the meaning of the grammatical unit is not rendered in the translation since it is practically identical to the meaning of some other unit and can be safely left out. In the sentence "By that time he had already left Britain" – К этому времени он уже уехал из Англии – the idea of priority expressed by the Past Perfect Tense needn't be separately reproduced in TT as it is made superfluous by the presence of "by that time" and "already".

2. Approximate translations when the translator makes use of a TL form partially equivalent to the equivalent-lacking SL unit, e.g.: I saw him enter the room – Я видел, как он вошел в комнату. The Russian language has no complex objects of this type but the meaning of the object clause is a sufficient approximation.

3. Transformational translation when the translator resorts to one of the grammatical transformations, e.g.: Your presence at the meeting is not obligatory. Nor is it desirable – Ваше присутствие на собрании необязательно и даже нежелательно (the syntactical integration).

As has been emphasized, equivalents are not mechanical substitutes for SL units but they may come handy as a starting point in search of adequate translation. The translator will much profit if he knows many permanent equivalents, is good at selecting among variable equivalents and resourceful at creating occasional equivalents, taking into account all contextual factors.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What is the result of the structural similarity of ST and TT? Is the notion of equivalence applicable to the correlated SL and TL units in these texts?
2. How can regular equivalents be defined? How are they discovered? How can they be classified? What role do they play in the translation practice?
3. How are regular equivalents used in the translating process? What is context? What types of context influence the choice of an equivalent? What is an occasional equivalent?
4. What are equivalent-lacking words? What types of words have, as a rule, no regular equivalents? What are the principal ways of rendering the meaning of an equivalent-lacking word in translation?
5. What are equivalent-lacking grammatical forms? What role does the grammatical meaning play in the formation of text semantics? What are the principal ways of rendering the grammatical meaning in translation?
6. What is the role of SL syntactical structures in translation? How does the type of the syntactical structure in SL influence the choice of equivalents in TL? What are the main features of the meaning of the English attributive groups and how are they rendered into Russian?
7. What are the main types of set expressions? What role do set expressions play in communication? What role do they play in the translating process?
8. What is an idiom? What are the meaningful components of an idiom? In what way can an equivalent to a SL idiom be found in TL? What factors should be considered in selecting such an equivalent?

Text

DIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES

The problem I propose to discuss is rather a hard nut to crack. Why does homo sapiens, whose digestive track functions in precisely the same complicated ways the world over, whose biochemical fabric and genetic potential are essentially common in all peoples and at every stage of social evolution – why does this unified mammalian species not use one common language? It inhales, for its life processes, one chemical element and dies if deprived of it. It makes do with the same number of teeth and vertebrae. In the light of anatomical and neurophysiological universals, a unitary language solution would be readily understandable. But there is also another "natural" model. A deaf, non-literate observer approaching the planet from outside and reporting on crucial aspects of human appearance and behaviour, would conclude with some confidence that men speak a small number of different, though probably related, tongues. He would guess at a figure of the order of half a dozen with perhaps a cluster of dialects or pidgins. This number would be persuasively concordant with other major parameters of human diversity. Why, then, this mystery of Babel?

ASPECTS OF TRANSLATING PROCESS

Basic Assumptions

Description of the translating process is one of the major tasks of the translation theory. Here we deal with the dynamic aspects of translator trying to understand how the translator performs the transfer operation from ST to TT.

Psychologically viewed, the translating process must needs include two mental processes-understanding and verbalization. First, the translator understands the contents of ST, that is, reduces the information it contains to his own mental program, and then he develops this program into TT. The problem is that these mental processes are not directly observable and we do not know much of what that program is and how the reduction and development operations are performed. That is why the translating process has to be described in some indirect way. The translation theory achieves this aim by postulating a number of translation models.

A *model* is a conventional representation of the translating process describing mental operations by which the source text or some part of it may be translated, irrespective of whether these operations are actually performed by the translator. It may describe the translating process either in a general form or by listing a number of specific operations (or transformations) through which the process can, in part, be realized. Translation models can be oriented either toward the situation reflected in the ST contents or toward the meaningful components of the ST contents.

The existing models of the translating process are, in fact, based on the same assumptions which we considered in discussing the problem of equivalence, namely, the *situationa1* (or referential) *model* is based on the identity of the situations described in the original text and in the translation, and the *semantic-transformational model* postulates the similarity of basic notions and nuclear structures in different languages. These postulates are supposed to explain the dynamic aspects of translation. In other words, it is presumed that the translator actually makes a mental travel from the original to some interlingual level of equivalence and then further on to the text of translation.

In the situational model this intermediate level is extralinguistic. It is the described reality, the facts of life that are represented by the verbal description. The process of translating presumably consists in the translator getting beyond the original text to the actual situation described in it. This is the first step of the process, i.e. the break-through to the situation. The second step is for the translator to describe this situation in the target language. Thus the process goes from the text in one language through the extralinguistic situation to the text in another language. The translator first understands what the original is about and then says "the same things" in TL.

For instance, the translator reads in A. Cronin's "Citadel" the description of the main character coming by train to a new place of work: "Manson walked quickly down the platform, searching eagerly for some signs of welcome". He tries to understand what reality lies behind the words "searching eagerly for some signs of welcome". The man was alone in a strange place and couldn't expect any welcome committee or deputation. Obviously, he just wanted to see whether anyone was there to meet him. So, the translator describes the situation in Russian in the following way:

"Мэнсон быстро прошел по перрону, оглядываясь, не встречает ли его кто-нибудь".

A different approach was used by E. Nida who suggested that the translating process may be described as a series of transformations. The transformational model postulates that in any two languages there is a number of nuclear structures which are fully equivalent to each other. Each language has an area of equivalence in respect to the other language. It is presumed that the translator does the translating in three transformational strokes. First – the stage of analysis – he transforms the original structures into the nuclear structures, i.e. he performs transformation within SL. Second – the stage of translation proper – he replaces the SL nuclear structures with the equivalent nuclear structures in TL. And third – the stage of synthesis – he develops the latter into the terminal structures in the text of translation.

Thus if the English sentence "It is very strange this domination of our intellect by our digestive organs" (J.K. Jerome) is translated into Russian as "Странно, до какой степени пищеварительные органы властвуют над нашим рассудком" we presume that the structures "domination of our intellect" and "domination by our digestive organs" were first reduced to the nuclear structures "organs dominate" and "they dominate intellect", respectively. Then they were replaced by the equivalent Russian structures "органы властвуют" and "они властвуют над рассудком", after which the nuclear structures were transformed into the final Russian variant.

A similar approach can be used to describe the translation of semantic units. The semantic model postulates the existence of the "deep" semantic categories common to SL and TL. It is presumed that the translator first reduces the semantic units of the original to these basic semantic categories and then expresses the appropriate notions by the semantic units of TL. Thus if he comes across the sentence "John is the proud owner of a new car", he is first to realize that it actually means that "John has a new car and that "he is proud because of that". After transferring these basic ideas to Russian and converting them to the semantically acceptable phrases he will get the translation "У Джона (есть) новая машина, которой он очень гордится".

In describing the process of translating we can explain the obtained variants as the result of the translator applying one or all of these models of action. This does not mean that a translation is actually made through the stages suggested by these models. They are not, however, just abstract schemes. Training translators we may teach them to use these models as practical tools. Coming across a specific problem in ST the translator should classify it as situational, structural or semantic and try to solve it by resorting to the appropriate procedure. If, for instance, in the sentence "He is a poor sleeper" the translator sees that the attributive group cannot be directly transferred into Russian, he can find that the transformational model will do the trick for him here and transform the attributive group into a verb-adverb phrase: "Он плохо спит".

Another approach to the description of the process of translating consists in the identification of different types of operations performed by the translator. Here the process is viewed as a number of manipulations with the form or content of the original, as a result of which the translator creates the text in the target language. The type of operation is identified by comparing the initial and the final texts.

The f i r s t group of operations (or transformations) is characterized by imitation of the form of a word or of a collocation. In the first case the translator tries to represent the pronunciation or the spelling of the foreign word with the TL letters. Thus we get such translations as "битник", "стриптиз", "эскалация", etc. This method is usually called translational transcription. A number of rules have been formulated as to the choice of Russian letters to represent the English sounds or letters, and the translator is expected to observe them in his work.

In the second case the translator creates a blueprint collocation in TL by using a loan translation. This results in such forms as "мозговой трест" (brain trust), "работа по правилам" (work-to-rule), "люди доброй воли" (people of good will).

The s e c o n d group of operations includes all types of lexical transformations involving certain semantic changes. As a result, the meaning of a word or word combination in ST may be made more specific, more general or somewhat modified as a way to discovering an appropriate equivalent in TL.

The choice of a more specific word in translation which gives a more detailed description of the idea than does the word in SL is a very common case in the English-Russian translating process. English often makes use of general terms to describe very definite objects or actions. The following sentence refers to a frightened woman trying to hide from an intruder who had suddenly burst into the room where she was pensively looking into the fire:

My mother **had left** her chair in her agitation, and **gone** behind it in the corner. (Ch. Dickens)

An attempt to use regular Russian equivalents for such general English verbs as "to leave" and "to go" will produce a ludicrous Russian phrase like this: "Матушка оставила свое кресло и пошла за него в угол".

To cope with the problem a contextual substitute may be created by using the detailing technique, i.e. by describing how the woman performed those actions instead of just naming them, e.g.: Взволнованная матушка **вскочила** со своего кресла и **забилась** в угол позади него.

One more example. Coming home after a long absence a young boy finds everything changed and no longer his own:

My old dear bedroom was changed, and I was **to lie a long way off.**

A blueprint Russian translation of this sentence would be hardly intelligible. Why should anyone "lie a long way off from a bedroom? Obviously, "to lie" means "to go to bed" and "a long way off" is in some other part of the same house. If so, why not say it in so many words? This is just the way to produce a contextual substitute: Моей милой старой спальни уже не было, и должен был спать **в другом конце дома.**

The opposite procedure, i.e. the use of an equivalent with a more general meaning, is not so common in translations from English into Russian, e.g.:

I packed my two **Gladstones.** Я упаковал свои два **чемодана.**

For obvious reasons the translator preferred a generic name to the specific name of the kind of suitcase that the Russian reader is unfamiliar with.

Another type of lexical transformations is often called "modulation". It involves the creation of an equivalent by replacing a unit in SL with a TL unit the meaning of which can be logically deduced from it and which is just another way of referring to the same object or an aspect of the same situation. Consider the following sentence:

Manson **slung his bag up** and climbed into a battered gig **behind** a tall, **angular** black horse. (A. Cronin)

It confronts the translator with a number of problems. First, what should be said in Russian for "to sling a bag up"? Second, in Russian it seems so obvious that one gets into a gig behind and not in front of the horse that any mention of the fact is preposterous unless it is implied that the horse was in the gig, too. Third, "an angular horse" cannot be either "угловая" or "угловатая лошадь".

All these translation problems can be solved with the help of contextual substitutes. "Slinging the bag up" evidently implies that the bag was placed into the gig, "climbing into the gig behind the horse" certainly means that this horse was harnessed to the gig and "an angular horse" is probably a horse with bones sticking out at angles, i.e. a bony or skinny animal. The Russian translation can therefore express these derived ideas to describe the identical situation, e.g.:

Мэнсон **поставил свой чемодан** и влез в расхлябанную двуколку, **запряженную** крупной **костлявой** черной лошадью.

In such cases the substitute often has a cause-and-effect relationship with the original:

The window was full of clothes I wouldn't want **to be seen dead in.** В витрине были выставлены платья, в которых я не хотела бы даже **лежать в гробу.**

A dead person is usually put in a coffin and "to be seen dead in a dress" logically implies lying in the coffin in such a dress. One more example.

People **who have tried** it, tell me that a clear conscience makes you very happy and contented. (J.K. Jerome)

A direct translation of "who have tried it" is hardly possible. But if somebody has tried something he has some experience about it. So, the translation may run as follows:

Некоторые люди, **ссылаясь на собственный опыт,** утверждают, что чистая совесть делает человека веселым и счастливым.

The t h i r d group of translating procedures comprises all types o transformations involving units of SL grammar. The translator may solve his problems by preserving the syntactic structure of the source text and using the analogous TL grammatical forms or "a word-for-word translation". This may be called "a zero transformation" and can be easily exemplified, e.g.:

John took Mary by the hand. Джон взял Мери за руку.

In other cases the translator may resort to various types of grammatical substitutes.

First, we may mention two types of transformations which change the number of sentences in TT as compared to ST.

As a rule, the translator renders the original text sentence by sentence and the number of sentences remains the same. However, it may so happen that the structural and semantic problems of a translation event can be best solved by breaking an original sentence into two parts, i.e. translating it with two sentences in TL. Another type of such partitioning is to replace a simple sentence in the original with a complex one in the translation, comprising one or several subordinate clauses.

The problems that can be solved through this technique are varied. First of all it may come handy in dealing with the English syntactic complexes which pack in two subject-predicate units, each unit making up a sentence or a clause in the Russian translation, e.g.:
I want you to speak English. Я хочу, чтобы вы говорили по-английски.

She hates his behaving in this way. Ей очень не нравится, что он так себя ведет.

The partitioning of sentences in translation can also be used to overcome the difficulties caused by the idiomatic semantic structure of the original text, e.g.:

This was a man to be seen to be understood.

Чтобы понять этого человека, надо было его увидеть.

Sometimes the translator can prefer partitioning to the other possible methods of translation, as producing a variant more suitable stylistically or emotionally. Consider the following examples:

The annual surveys of the Labour Government were not discussed with the workers at any stage, but only with the employers.

The contrast in the last part of the sentence can be best reproduced in Russian by making a separate unit of it, e.g.:

Ежегодные обзоры лейбористского правительства не обсуждались среди рабочих ни на каком этапе. Они обсуждались только с предпринимателями.

And this is how this procedure can be used to reproduce the emotional implications of the original:

How well I recollect it, on a cold grey afternoon, with a dull sky, threatening rain. (Ch. Dickens)

Как хорошо помню я наш приезд! Вечереет, холодно, пасмурно, хмурое небо грозит дождем.

The opposite procedure means integrating two or more original sentences into one or compressing a complex sentence into a simple one. This technique is also used both for structural and semantic reasons.

Sometimes one of the sentences is grammatically too incomplete to warrant its separate reproduction in translation:

It is not possible to do the work in two days. Nor is it necessary.

Выполнить эту работу за два дня нет ни возможности, ни необходимости.

The integration procedure may be necessitated by close semantic tie between adjacent sentences:

We did not want scenery. We wanted to have our supper and go to bed.

Мы не хотели красивых пейзажей – мы хотели поужинать и лечь спать.

The partitioning and integration procedures may be used together, resulting in a kind of syntactic and semantic reshuffle of sentences in translation. Here is an example:

But occasionally an indiscretion takes place, such as that of Mr. Woodrow Wyatt, Labour M.P., when Financial Secretary to the War Office. He boasted of the prowess of British spies in obtaining information regarding armed forces of the USSR. (J. Gollan)

The end of the first sentence is replaced by the personal pronoun in the second sentence. The sentence can, therefore, be broken into two and it last part integrated with the second sentence, e.g.:

Однако по временам допускается нескромность. Так, например, лейборист, член парламента Вудро Уайтт в бытность свою финансовым секретарем военного министерства хвастался ловкостью, проявленной английскими шпионами в деле получения сведений о вооруженных силах СССР.

Another type of grammatical transformations is characterized by the translator's refusal to use analogous grammatical units in TT. He tries to render the meaning of SL units by changing the grammatical form of a word the part of speech or the type of the sentence.

Such changes are very common and the translator should never hesitate to use them whenever necessary. Here are some examples:

We are searching for **talent** everywhere.

Мы повсюду ищем **таланты.**

I am a very rapid **packer.**

Я очень быстро **укладываюсь.**

It is our **hope** that an agreement will be reached by Friday.

Мы надеемся, что к пятнице будет достигнуто соглашение.

He does not mind **your joining our group.**

Он ничего не имеет против того, чтобы вы присоединились к нашей группе.

Finally, there is a group of transformations which ensure the required degree of equivalence by a number of changes of both lexical and grammatical nature. They involve a different arrangement of ideas, a different point of view and other semantic modifications whenever a direct translation of a SL unit proves impossible. A typical example of such a procedure is the so-called antonymous translation describing the situation, as it were, from the opposite point of view and rendering an affirmative SL structure by a negative TL one or vice versa:

The door was not **unbolted.** Дверь была **на засове.**

A complex change also occurs in explicatory translations in which a SL unit is replaced by a TL word combination describing or defining its meaning:

A demonstration of British **conservationists** was held in Trafalgar Square yesterday.

Вчера на Трафальгар-сквер состоялась демонстрация английских **сторонников охраны окружающей среды.**

In conclusion, we should mention one more specific procedure which may come handy to the translator when he is baffled by an apparently unsolvable translation problem. It may be called the compensation technique and is defined as a deliberate introduction of some additional elements in translation to make up for the loss of similar elements at the same or an earlier stage. For instance, Eliza in B. Shaw's "Pygmalion" makes a mistake typical for the speech of an uneducated person: "I'm nothing to you – not so much as **them** slippers." And Professor Higgins corrects her saying: "those slippers". The linguistic error in the episode is untranslatable and its loss makes this dialogue meaningless. But the loss can be compensated for by introducing a mistake – and its correction – at a point where everything is correct in the original but where an uneducated Russian speaker is likely to make it. As a result in the translation Eliza says: "Я для вас ничто, хуже вот этих **туфлей.**" And Higgins can self-righteously correct her: "туфель".

The compensation method is often used to render the stylistic or emotional implications of the original. Consider the following example.

They had reached the mysterious mill where the red tape was spun, and Yates was determined to cut through it here and now. (S. Heym)

"Red tape" is translated as "bureaucracy" but the latter cannot be spun at a mill. And the translator invents his own figure of speech to compensate for the loss:

Они уперлись в стену штабной бюрократии, но Йейтс твердо решил тут же пробить эту стену.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What is traditionally meant by translation"? What is the translating process? What mental processes make up the translating process?
2. How can the translating process be studied and described? What is a model of translation? How can translation models be classified? What are the strong and the weak points of translation modelling?
3. What are the relationships between the contents of a text am extralinguistic realities? What is meant by the "situation"? How does the situational model describe the translating process?
4. What are the basic assumptions of the semantic-transformational model of translation? What types of transformations can be used in the translating process? Do all such transformations involve semantic shifts?
5. What transformations are oriented towards the form of the SL units What is the difference between transcription and transliteration? How are transcription and transliteration used in the translating process? What are loan translations?
6. What are the main types of lexical transformations? Do lexical transformations imply semantic changes? How can the logical operations c specification and generalization be used in the translating process? What is modulation?
7. What are the main types of grammatical transformations? What is word-for-word (blueprint) translation? What are the characteristic features of the partitioning and integration techniques? In what way can grammatical units be transformed in the translating process?
8. What are complex translation transformations? What is the technique of antonymous translation? What is the role of compensation in translation?

Text

THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

Until the close of World War II active speculation about the technological features of the future was restricted in the main to the literature of science fiction. This literature was regarded until then as an exhilarating avenue of escape from the humdrum of the all-too-solid present. Undeterred by premonitions, the reader's imagination could soar freely through time and space. He might even smile at the naive reassurance provided by some of the tales of such pioneers of the genre as Jules Verne and H.G. Wells, in which contemporary society continued to move soporifically along its customary grooves undeflected by the cataclysmic discoveries of some scientific maniac. And what could be cosier than a Wellsian time machine that, following a fearsome trip into the far future, could be depended upon to return the author to the present in good time for tea around the parlour fire? It is this once-powerful sense of the here-and-now that has begun to recede since the War. Much that was only yesterday relegated airily to the realm of science fiction is now recognized as sober scientific fact. And there is virtually nothing in today's science fiction that is thought of as "impossible" tomorrow. The increasing pace of technological and social change in the post-war world is actively dissolving the familiar signposts of our civilization before our media-soaked eyes. Willingly or reluctantly we are impelled to give more and more of our attention to the shape of things to come.

PRAGMATICS OF TRANSLATION

Basic Assumptions

Words in language are related to certain referents which they designate and to other words of the same language with which they make up syntactic units. These relationships are called semantic and syntactic, respectively. Words are also related to the people who use them. To the users of the language its words are not just indifferent, unemotional labels of objects or ideas. The people develop a certain attitude to the words they use. Some of the words acquire definite implications, they evoke a positive or negative response, they are associated with certain theories, beliefs, likes or dislikes. There are "noble" words like "honour, dignity, freedom", etc. and "low" words like "infamy, cowardice, betrayal". Words can be nice or ugly, attractive or repulsive. Such relationships between the word and its users are called "pragmatic".

The pragmatic implications of a word are an important part of its meaning that produces a certain effect upon the Receptor. Of even greater significance is the pragmatic aspect of speech units. Every act of speech communication is meant for a certain Receptor, it is aimed at producing a certain effect upon him. In this respect any communication is an exercise in pragmatics.

Since the pragmatic effect plays such an important part in communication, its preservation in translation is the primary concern of the translator, though it is by no means an easy task. The pragmatic aspect of translation involves a number of difficult problems.

To begin with, the pragmatics of the original text cannot be as a rule directly reproduced in translation but often require important changes in the transmitted message. Correlated words in different languages may produce dissimilar effect upon the users. An "ambition" in English is just the name of a quality which may evoke any kind of response – positive, negative or neutral. Its Russian counterpart "амбиция" is definitely not a nice word. Thus, the phrase "The voters put an end to the general's political ambitions" can be translated as "Избиратели положили конец политическим амбициям генерала", retaining the negative implication of the original, but if the implication were positive the translator would not make use of the derogatory term. The sentence "The boy's ambition was to become a pilot" will be translated as "Мечтой мальчика было стать летчиком".
Such words as "idealism" or "nationalism" often have a positive effect in the English text and are rendered into Russian not as "идеализм" or "национализм" but as "служение идеалам, бескорыстие" and "национальное самосознание, национальные интересы", respectively.

When we consider not just separate words but a phrase or number of phrases in a text, the problem becomes more complicated. The communicative effect of a speech unit does not depend on the meaning of its components alone, but involves considerations of the situational context and the previous experience. A report that John has run a hundred metres in 9 seconds will pass unnoticed by some people and create a sensation with others who happen to know that it is a wonderful record-breaking achievement.

Here again, a great role is played by differences in the historical and cultural backgrounds of different language communities, in their customs and living conditions. It stands to reason that the natives of a tropical island can hardly be impressed by the statement that something is "as white as snow". The reported "cooling" in the relations between two friends may be understood as a welcome development by the people who live in a very hot climate.

It seems imperative, therefore, that translation should involve a kind of pragmatic adaptation to provide for the preservation of the original communicative effect. This adaptation must ensure that the text of translation conveys the same attitude to the reported facts as does the original text. It goes without saying that in an adequate translation the comical should not be replaced by the tragical or a praise turned into a censure.

The pragmatic adaptation of the translation must also see to it that TR understands the implications of the message and is aware of its figurative or situational meaning. A phrase like "Smith made another touchdown in three minutes" refers to a situation which does not mean anything to a Russian Receptor who does not know anything about the rules of American football. When the English original just refers to the First Amendment, the Russian translation should make it more explicit by speaking about the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; otherwise TR will not understand what it is all about.

It is obvious that there can be no equivalence if the original text is clear and unequivocal while its translation is obscure and hard to understand.

Discussing the problem of equivalence at different levels, we have emphasized the necessity of making the translation as understandable and intelligible as the original text is. We have also taken care to include in the overall meaning of the text all its emotional, figurative and associative implications. The pragmatic adaptation of this kind is an integral part of translation procedures which ensure the necessary level of equivalence.

The pragmatics of the text, which are linguistically relevant and depend on the relationships between the linguistic signs and language users, are part of the contents of the text. It is a meaningful element whose preservation in translation is desirable at any level of equivalence. It is reproduced in translation if TR gets the whole information about the pragmatic aspects of the original text and the pragmatics of the original text are just as accessible and understandable to him as they are to SR. This does not imply that he will be actually influenced by this information or react to it in the same way.

Apart from the pragmatics of linguistic signs, there are also the pragmatics of individual speech acts. In a concrete act of speech the Source has to do with the specific Receptor upon whom he tries to produce the desired effect, and from whom he would like to elicit the desired reaction.

This second type of pragmatics is also present in translation events. A translation event is a kind of speech act and it is performed with a certain pragmatic purpose as well. But here we are confronted with a more complicated process than in ordinary speech.

A translation event is pragmatically oriented in two directions. On the one hand, it is translation which means that its primary purpose is to give the closest possible approximation to the original text. This orientation towards a foreign text is one aspect of its pragmatics.

But on the other hand, a translation event is a concrete speech act in the target language. Therefore, it is not just an act of interlingual communication between the Source and TR, but also an act of speech communication between the Translator and TR. This involves two important implications. First, a translation event may be pragmatically oriented toward a concrete TR, and, second, it is the result of the activities of a concrete translator, who may have some additional pragmatic motivation, may pursue some aims beside and beyond the true reproduction of the original text.

As long as translation is not just an exercise in producing an equivalent text in another language but a pragmatic act under specific circumstances, its results can be assessed both in terms of its loyalty to the original and its ability to achieve the purpose for which it has been undertaken. This necessitates the introduction of the concept of the "pragmatic value" in translation, which assesses its success in achieving this pragmatic super-purpose.

As has been pointed out, the additional pragmatic goal of the translation event may depend either on the particular type of TR or on the translator's designs beyond his call of duty as a no-nonsense transmitter of the original message.

The users of the translation often make judgements of its quality exclusively on its merits as an instrument in achieving some specific aim. If in doing it, the translation departs from the original text, so much the worse for the latter. In this way the pragmatics of translation acquire a new dimension. E. Nida introduced the concept of "dynamic equivalence" which should be judged not against the original but against the Receptor's reactions. For many practical purposes the process of translation is predominantly oriented towards TR. So, translation of the maintenance instructions is considered good if, after reading it, a technician will be able to operate the appropriate piece of machinery correctly.

Sometimes books written for adults are translated for children's reading with appropriate alterations made in the course of translation. Presumably any text should be differently translated depending on whether it is for experts or laymen, for staging or screening, and so on.

As to the specific aims pursued by the translator, they may also bring about considerable changes in the resulting text with no direct bearing on the original. Each translation is made in a certain pragmatic or social context, and its results are used for a number of purposes. The translator is assigned his task and paid for it by the people for whom his work is not an end in itself but an instrument for achieving some other ends. Aware of this, the translator tries to make his work meet these "extra-translational requirements, introducing appropriate changes in the text of translation. Sometimes these changes are prompted by the desire to produce a certain effect on the Receptors, which has already been mentioned.

The specific goal, which makes the translator modify the resulting text, often means that, for all practical purposes, he assumes an additional role and is no longer just a translator. He may set himself some propaganda or educational task, he may be particularly interested in some part of the original and wants to make a special emphasis on it, he may try to impart to the Receptor his own feelings about the Source or the event described in the original. In pursuance of his plans the translator may try to simplify, abridge or modify the original message, deliberately reducing the degree of equivalence in his translation.

It is clear that such cases go far beyond the inherent aspects of translation and it is not the task of the translation theory to analyse or pass a judgement on them. But the translator should be aware of this possibility for it will have an impact on his strategy.

In many types of translation any attempt by the translator to modify his text for some extra-translational purpose will be considered unprofessional conduct and severely condemned. But there are also some other types of translation where particular aspects of equivalence are of little interest and often disregarded.

When a book is translated with a view to subsequent publication in another country, it may be adapted or abridged to meet the country's standards for printed matter. The translator may omit parts of the book or some descriptions considered too obscene or naturalistic for publication in his country, though permissible in the original.

In technical or other informative translations the translator or his employers may be interested in getting the gist of the contents or the most important or novel part of it, which may involve leaving out certain details or a combination of translation with brief accounts of less important parts of the original. A most common feature of such translations is neglect of the stylistic and structural peculiarities of the original. In this case translation often borders on retelling or precis writing.

A specific instance is consecutive interpretation where the interpreter is often set a time limit within which he is expected to report his translation no matter how long the original speech may have been. This implies selection, generalizations, and cutting through repetitions, incidental digressions, occasional slips or excessive embellishments.

It is obvious that in all similar cases the differences which can be revealed between the original text and its translation should not be ascribed to the translator's inefficiency or detract from the quality of his work. The pragmatic value of such translations clearly compensates for their lack of equivalence. Evidently there are different types of translation serving different purposes.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What is pragmatics? What is the difference between semantics, syntactics and pragmatics? What relationships can exist between the word and its users?
2. What role do the pragmatic aspects play in translation? Can correlated words in SL and TL have dissimilar effect upon the users? How should the pragmatic meaning of the word be rendered in translation?
3. What does the communicative effect of a speech unil depend upon? What factors influence the understanding of TT? What is background information?
4. What are the relationships between pragmatics and equivalence? Can semantically equivalent speech units in ST and TT produce different effects upon their readers?
5. How is the translation event oriented pragmatically? Is its only purpose to produce the closest approximation to ST? What additional pragmatic factors may have their impact on the specific translation event?
6. How is the translating process oriented toward a concrete TR? What does "dynamic equivalence" mean? What is the pragmatic value of translation?
7. What additional goals may the translator pursue in the translating 47 process? In what way can such a "super-purpose" influence the process? Can the translator play some "extra-translational" roles in his work?
8. What is the pragmatic adaptation of TT? What are the main factors necessitating such adaptation? What changes may be introduced in the translating process due to the pragmatic requirements?

Text
THE PATH OF PROGRESS

The process of change was set in motion everywhere from Land's End to John O'Groats. But it was in northern cities that our modern world was born. These stocky, taciturn people were the first to live by steam, cogs, iron, and engine grease, and the first in modern times to demonstrate the dynamism of the human condition. This is where, by all the rules of heredity, the artificial satellite and the computer were conceived. Baedeker may not recognize it, but it is one of history's crucibles. Until the start of the technical revolution, in the second half of the eighteenth century, England was an agricultural country, only slightly invigorated by the primitive industries of the day. She was impelled, for the most part, by muscular energies – the strong arms of her islanders, the immense legs of her noble horses. But she was already mining coal and smelting iron, digging canals and negotiating bills of exchange. Agriculture itself had changed under the impact of new ideas: the boundless open fields of England had almost all been enclosed, and lively farmers were experimenting with crop rotation, breeding methods and winter feed. There was a substantial merchant class already, fostered by trade and adventure, and a solid stratum of literate yeomen.

MAIN TYPES OF TRANSLATION

Basic Assumptions

Though the basic characteristics of translation can be observed in all translation events, different types of translation can be singled out spending on the predominant communicative function of the source text or the form of speech involved in the translation process. Thus we can distinguish between *literary* and *informative* translation, on the one hand, and between *written* and *oral* translation (or interpretation), on the other hand.

Literary translation deals with literary texts, i.e. works of fiction or poetry whose main function is to make an emotional or aesthetic impression upon the reader. Their communicative value depends, first and foremost, on their artistic quality and the translator's primary task is to reproduce this quality in translation.

Informative translation is rendering into the target language non-literary texts, the main purpose of which is to convey a certain amount of ideas, to inform the reader. However, if the source text is of some length, its translation can be listed as literary or informative only as an approximation. A literary text may, in fact, include some parts of purely informative character. Contrariwise, informative translation may comprise some elements aimed at achieving an aesthetic effect. Within each group further gradations can be made to bring out more specific problems in literary or informative translation.

Literary works are known to fall into a number of genres. Literary translations may be subdivided in the same way, as each genre calls for a specific arrangement and makes use of specific artistic means to impress the reader. Translators of prose, poetry or plays have their own problems. Each of these forms of literary activities comprises a number of subgenres and the translator may specialize in one or some of them in accordance with his talents and experience. The particular tasks inherent in the translation of literary works of each genre are more literary than linguistic. The great challenge to the translator is to combine the maximum equivalence and the high literary merit.

The translator of a belles-lettres text is expected to make a careful study of the literary trend the text belongs to, the other works of the same author, the peculiarities of his individual style and manner and so on. This involves both linguistic considerations and skill in literary criticism. A good literary translator must be a versatile scholar and a talented writer or poet.

A number of subdivisions can be also suggested for informative translations, though the principles of classification here are somewhat different. Here we may single out translations of scientific and technical texts, of newspaper materials, of official papers and some other types of texts such as public speeches, political and propaganda materials, advertisements, etc., which are, so to speak, intermediate, in that there is a certain balance between the expressive and referential functions, between reasoning and emotional appeal.

Translation of scientific and technical materials has a most important role to play in our age of the revolutionary technical progress. There is hardly a translator or an interpreter today who has not to deal with technical matters. Even the "purely" literary translator often comes across highly technical stuff in works of fiction or even in poetry. An in-depth theoretical study of the specific features of technical translation is an urgent task of translation linguistics while training of technical translators is a major practical problem.

In technical translation the main goal is to identify the situation described in the original. The predominance of the referential function is a great challenge to the translator who must have a good command of the technical terms and a sufficient understanding of the subject matter to be able to give an adequate description of the situation even if this is not fully achieved in the original. The technical translator is also expected to observe the stylistic requirements of scientific and technical materials to make text acceptable to the specialist.

Some types of texts can be identified not so much by their positive distinctive features as by the difference in their functional characteristics in the two languages. English newspaper reports differ greatly from their Russian counterparts due to the frequent use of colloquial, slang and vulgar elements, various paraphrases, eye-catching headlines, etc.

When the translator finds in a newspaper text the headline "Minister bares his teeth on fluoridation" which just means that this minister has taken a resolute stand on the matter, he will think twice before referring to the minister's teeth in the Russian translation. He would rather use a less expressive way of putting it to avoid infringement upon the accepted norms of the Russian newspaper style.

Apart from technical and newspaper materials it may be expedient to single out translation of official diplomatic papers as a separate type of informative translation. These texts make a category of their own because of the specific requirements to the quality of their translations. Such translations are often accepted as authentic official texts on a par with the originals. They are important documents every word of which must be carefully chosen as a matter of principle. That makes the translator very particular about every little meaningful element of the original which he scrupulously reproduces in his translation. This scrupulous imitation of the original results sometimes in the translator more readily erring in literality than risking to leave out even an insignificant element of the original contents.

Journalistic (or publicistic) texts dealing with social or political matters are sometimes singled out among other informative materials because they may feature elements more commonly used in literary text (metaphors, similes and other stylistic devices) which cannot but influence the translator's strategy. More often, however, they are regarded as a kind of newspaper materials (periodicals).

There are also some minor groups of texts that can be considered separately because of the specific problems their translation poses to the translator. They are film scripts, comic strips, commercial advertisements and the like. In dubbing a film the translator is limited in his choice of variants by the necessity to fit the pronunciation of the translated words to the movement of the actor's lips. Translating the captions in a comic strip, the translator will have to consider the numerous allusions to the facts well-known to the regular readers of comics but less familiar to the Russian readers. And in dealing with commercial advertisements he must bear in mind that their sole purpose is to win over the prospective customers. Since the text of translation will deal with quite a different kind of people than the original advertisement was meant for, there is the problem of achieving the same pragmatic effect by introducing the necessary changes in the message. This confronts the translator with the task of the pragmatic adaptation in translation.

Though the lecture is concerned with the problems of written translation from English into Russian, some remarks should be made about the obvious classification of translations as written or oral. As the names suggest, in written translation the source text is in written form, as is the target text. In oral translation or interpretation the interpreter listens to the oral presentation of the original and translates it as an oral message in TL. As a result, in the first case the Receptor of the translation can read it while in the second case he hears it.

There are also some intermediate types. The interpreter rendering his translation by word of mouth may have the text of the original in front of him and translate it "at sight". A written translation can be made of the original recorded on the magnetic tape that can be replayed as many times as is necessary for the translator to grasp the original meaning. The translator can dictate his "at sight" translation of a written text to the typist or a short-hand writer with TR getting the translation in written form.

These are all, however, modifications of the two main types of translation. The line of demarcation between written and oral translation is drawn not only because of their forms but also because of the sets of conditions in which the process takes place. The first is continuous, the other momentary. In written translation the original can be read and re-read as many times as the translator may need or like. The same goes for the final product. The translator can re-read his translation, compare it to the original, make the necessary corrections or start his work all over again. He can come back to the preceding part of the original or get the information he needs from the subsequent messages. These are most favourable conditions and here we can expect the best performance and the highest level of equivalence. That is why in theoretical discussions we have usually examples from written translations where the translating process can be observed in all its aspects.

The conditions of oral translation impose a number of important restrictions on the translator's performance. Here the interpreter receives a fragment of the original only once and for a short period of time. His translation is also a one-time act with no possibility of any return to the original or any subsequent corrections. This creates additional problems and the users have sometimes to be content with a lower level of equivalence.

There are two main kinds of oral translation – consecutive and simultaneous. In consecutive translation the translating starts after the original speech or some part of it has been completed. Here the interpreter's strategy and the final results depend, to a great extent, on the length of the segment to be translated. If the segment is just a sentence or two the interpreter closely follows the original speech. As often as not, however, the interpreter is expected to translate a long speech which has lasted for scores of minutes or even longer. In this case he has to remember a great number of messages and keep them in mind until he begins his translation. To make this possible the interpreter has to take notes of the original messages, various systems of notation having been suggested for the purpose. The study of, and practice in, such notation is the integral part of the interpreter's training as are special exercises to develop his memory.

Sometimes the interpreter is set a time limit to give his rendering, which means that he will have to reduce his translation considerably, selecting and reproducing the most important parts of the original and dispensing with the rest. This implies the ability to make a judgement on the relative value of various messages and to generalize or compress the received information. The interpreter must obviously be a good and quickwitted thinker.

In simultaneous interpretation the interpreter is supposed to be able to give his translation while the speaker is uttering the original message. This can be achieved with a special radio or telephone-type equipment. The interpreter receives the original speech through his earphones and simultaneously talks into the microphone which transmits his translation to the listeners. This type of translation involves a number of psycholinguistic problems, both of theoretical and practical nature.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What are the two principles of translation classification? What are the main types of translation? What is the difference between literary and informative translations?
2. How can literary translations be subdivided? What is the main difficulty of translating a work of high literary merit? What qualities and skills are expected of a literary translator?
3. How can informative translations be subdivided? Are there any intermediate types of translation? What type of informative translations plays an especially important role in the modern world?
4. What is the main goal of a technical translation? What specific requirements is the technical translator expected to meet? What problems is the theory of technical translation concerned with?
5. What are the main characteristics of translations dealing with newspaper, diplomatic and other official materials? What specific problems emerge in translating film scripts and commercial advertisements?
6. What is the main difference between translation and interpretation? Which of them is usually made at a higher level of accuracy? Are there any intermediate forms of translation?
7. How can interpretation be classified? What are the characteristic features of

consecutive interpretation? What is the role of notation in consecutive interpretation?

Text

I

(SCIENTIFIC)

Water has the extraordinary ability to dissolve a greater variety of substances than any other liquid. Falling through the air it collects atmospheric gases, salts, nitrogen, oxygen and other compounds, nutrients and pollutants alike. The carbon dioxide it gathers reacts with the water to form carbonic acid. This, in turn, gives it greater power to break down rocks and soil particles that are subsequently put into solution as nutrients and utilized by growing plants and trees. Without this dissolving ability, our lakes and streams would be biological deserts, for pure water cannot sustain aquatic life. Water dissolves, cleanses, serves plants and animals as a carrier of food and minerals; it is the only substance that occurs in all three states – solid, liquid and gas – and yet always retains its own identity and emerges again as water.

II

(NEWSPAPER)

I am often asked what I think of the latest opinion poll, especially when it has published what appears to be some dramatic swing in "public opinion". It is as if the public seeing itself reflected in a mirror, seeks reassurance that the warts on the face of its opinion are not quite ugly as all that! I react to these inquiries from the ludicrous posture of a man who, being both a politician and a statistician cannot avoid wearing two hats. I am increasingly aware of the intangibility of the phenomenon described as "public opinion". It is the malevolent ghost in the haunted house of politics. But the definition of public opinion given by the majority of opinion polls is about the last source from which those responsible for deciding the great issues of the day should seek guidance.

Text Analysis

I

1. What type of text is it? What makes you think that it is informative? What type of words are predominant in the text? What branch of science do most of the terms belong to?

2. What is the difference between substance and matter? Why should water fall through the air? How can water "collect" various substances?

3. What elements make up carbonic dioxide? What is carbonic acid? What are carbonates? What other acids or salts do you know? What is solution? How does water provide food for plants and trees?

4. What is the difference between a stream and a river? What do plants need for their growth? When can a lake be called a biological desert? What is pure water? What is aquatic life? Why can pure water not sustain aquatic life?

5. Why can water be called a carrier of food? What do we call water in solid state? What is the general term for liquids and gases? How can water retain its identity? Does it mean that it always has the same properties or the same composition?

II

6. What type of text is this? Are there any literary devices in it? Is its subject literary or informative? Is it narrated in the first or in the third person? Is its author a man of letters or a scientist?

7. What is an opinion poll? What are people usually polled about? Are I the results of an opinion poll published in newspapers? What is a swing in public opinion? Why are the words "public opinion" written in inverted commas? What swing in public opinion may be described as dramatic?

8. In what mirror does the public see itself? What is a wart? What warts are referred to in the text? Why should the public seek any reassurance?

9. What does the author mean by saying that he has to wear two hats? In what way can a phenomenon be intangible? What is a haunted house? Is a "ghost" something real, easily defined or understood?

10. Does a "definition" mean in this context an explanation or the result? What is the meaning of the phrase "He is the last man to help you"? Does the author think the results of an opinion poll to be a reliable source of information?

TECHNIQUES OF TRANSLATION

Basic Assumptions

The study of the linguistic machinery of translation makes it possible to outline the main principles of the translator's strategy.

When confronted with the text to be translated, the translator's first concern is to understand it by assessing the meaning of language units in the text against the contextual situation and the pertaining extralinguistic facts. At the same time the translator must take care to avoid "thinking into" the text, i.e. adding the information which is not, in fact, present in ST.

Let us illustrate this procedure by a few examples. Suppose we have the following sentence: "The Union executive committee passed a resolution advising the workers to "sit-out" elections where neither party offers a candidate whom labor could support." Translating this sentence the translator has to solve a number of problems, trying to get to the meaning of some words or word combinations. He has two main pillars to sustain his judgements: the basic meaning of the unit and the contextual situation. Consider the phrase "to sit out the elections". The basic meaning of "to sit out" is clearly the opposite of "to sit in". One can obviously "sit in the house, the car, the shade", etc. or to "sit out of them", i.e. to be or stay outside some place or space. On the other hand, "to sit out a dance" means not to dance, that is, not to take part in this kind of activities. True, it often implies that you do it unwillingly, that you are just not invited to dance. In our case the workers are recommended to sit out elections by their own will, to show their disapproval of the candidates offered by the two parties. We may conclude that the workers are advised not to go to the polls or to boycott the elections.

Now what is the "Union executive committee" that made the recommendation? Theoretically speaking, any kind of union may have done it. But for practical purposes the translator will take into account the following considerations. First, it is clear that it is some kind of labor organization. Second, it is a union whose activities are directed by an executive committee. Third, the word "union" is often used as a short form for "trade-union" (cf. "a union card", "a union member", etc.). All these facts fit well together, while other possible meanings of "union" (cf. "Union Jack", "union suit" and the like) are obviously out of place. Thus it can be safely concluded that the translation should be «исполнительный комитет профсоюза».

Such conclusions are often made by the translator. What are "out-of-this-world meat prices"? "Meat prices" are prices you buy your meat at, but what is "out of this world"? Evidently, such prices are not "in this world", i.e. they are not found in it or not common to it. Thus the phrase implies "uncommon prices". But the major and perhaps the only characteristics of any prices is that they are either high or low. "Uncommon prices" can be either uncommonly high or uncommonly low. Now if the original runs: "The people are worried on account of the out-of-this-world meat prices", the choice is clear. Coming back to the linguistic form, the translator may observe that "out of this world" is a stronger way of putting it than is "uncommon". It is closer to "extraordinary", "fantastic", "unheard of, etc. Accordingly, the translation will be «непомерные (баснословные, неслыханные и пр.) цены на мясо».

Of great importance is the translator's ability to draw a line of demarcation between the exact information that can be really deduced from the text and the presence of several alternatives between which he cannot choose with sufficient certitude. Suppose a man is referred to in the original as "Price Stabilizer E. Arnall". The words "Price Stabilizer" are obviously used here as a sort of title. This can lead to a number of important conclusions. "Stabilizer" is obviously not an electrical appliance but "a man who stabilizes". Since it is not an honorary title it should refer to the man's position or occupation. The conclusion is that the man is concerned with the problem of price stabilization by virtue of his official duties. As these duties are mentioned as his personal title (observe the capital letters and the absence of the article), he cannot be an insignificant employee but is a man of high standing. He may be even the head of an office dealing with price-stabilization problems. But this is as far as our guesswork can go. We do not know the name of the office (a board, a committee, an agency, etc.) or whether its head (if E. Arnall is one) was referred to as director, manager or superintendent. Therefore we cannot use in the translation the words: «директор, управляющий, руководитель», etc. Nor can we give the name of his office. Unless we can find a way of getting the required information from some outside source, we shall have to stick to some non-committal variant, e.g. «Э. Арнал, ведающий вопросами стабилизации цен».

In our previous discussions we have noted that the semantic analysis of the text must take into account both the immediate surroundings, i.e. the meaning of other words and structures in the same sentence, and the broad context which comprises the contents of the whole original text, whether it is a small extract, an article or a large book.: The information that can be gleaned from the original text should be supplemented by the translator's knowledge of the actual facts of life. The words "out of this world" were translated above as «непомерно высокие» as we know that people are not ordinarily worried by prices being reduced.

Analyzing the contents of the original the translator makes the assessment of the relative communicative value of different meaningful elements. In most cases his professed aim is to achieve the closest approximation to the original, i.e. to reproduce its contents in all the details. As long as the linguistic or pragmatic reasons make it impossible and the translation involves a certain loss of information, the translator has not infrequently to choose between several evils. As often as not, one meaningful element of the original can be retained in translation only at the expense of omitting some other part of the contents. The translator has to decide what bits of information he is prepared to sacrifice and what elements of the original meaning are of greater communicative value and should be rendered at any cost.

The choice of the dominant aspect of meaning usually depends on the type of the text and the prevailing pragmatic considerations. While translating, for instance, figurative set expressions the translator may try to preserve their basic metaphorical meaning at the expense of other parts of the contents including the figure of speech that makes up the metaphorical structure of the collocation. In most cases the purport of communication is, first and foremost, to express a certain idea while the figurative way of expressing it is a kind of embellishment, a nice and pleasant luxury which can be dispensed with, if necessary. When "a skeleton in the family cupboard" becomes "a shameful family secret" in translation, there is certainly a loss in expressiveness, but the basic sense is well preserved. The metaphorical meaning will be chosen as the dominant part of the contents in most translations.

In a literary text the poetic or stylistic effect is no less important than the ideas conveyed. The same is true whenever the translator has to deal with a play on words or a sustained metaphor. In such cases the loss of the figurative element may make at least part of the text quite meaningless and it is often considered as the dominant component to be preserved in translation.

By way of example let us discuss the problems involved in the translation of a play upon words. Consider the following sentences:

"He ... said he had come for me, and informed me that he was a page." "Go 'long," I said, "you ain't more than a paragraph." (M. Twain)

It is clear that the second sentence would be meaningless but for the play upon the words "page" and "paragraph". The same is true about its translation which will be unintelligible unless the play on words is duly reproduced in TL. This is the dominant goal which should be achieved at all costs even though it might involve some inaccuracies in the translation of other elements.

This is not an easy task but it is not impossible, either. Here is how it was done by N. Chukovsky:

Он сказал, что послан за мною и что он глава пажей. – Какая ты глава, ты одна строчка! – сказал я ему.

It is worthwhile to observe the method that is used to overcome the difficulty. The Russian equivalent for a page boy has no other meaning (or homonym) which is associated with any part of a book or other printed matter. So the translator introduces another word «глава» and on its basis recreates the original play upon words. It does not matter that in doing it he makes the boy the head of the pages which he was probably not. The accurate information about the boy's official standing has obviously received a lower rating in the translator's assessment than the preservation of the stylistic effect. This inaccuracy seems to be a lesser evil, since the dominant aspect of the original contents is duly rendered in translation.

Assessing the relative communicative value of various elements in the original, it should be borne in mind that translations are made at different levels of equivalence reproducing different parts of the original contents. The identification of the situation and especially the purport of communication are indispensable and are preserved in practically all translations. Naturally, it is these components that usually make up the dominant sense to be reproduced, if necessary, at the expense of the rest of the contents.

The purport of communication and the identification of the situation are not, as a rule, expressed by some particular words or structures but by the whole unit of speech. Therefore it is often the case that the general sense of the unit as a whole is of greater communicative value than the meaning of its individual elements. The translator is thus prepared to sacrifice the part to the whole, the meaning of an element to the meaning of the whole.

This predominance of the whole makes an imprint upon some of the techniques used by translators both for understanding the original text and for establishing a kind of semantic bridge to the translation. It can be observed that the translator first tries to get the most general idea of what is said in the original, to find out, so to speak, "who does what and to whom", to understand the general semantic pattern or framework of the sentence and then fill in the particular details.

The translator may first resort to the word-for-word translation imitating the syntactic structure of the original and using the most common substitutes of all words. The same method can be used to facilitate understanding if the general meaning of the original text eludes the translator.

Thus the translating may begin with an imitation of the original structure in TL to see whether a word-for-word translation is possible or should be replaced by a different structure. In this way the translator decides upon the syntactic framework of his future translation. This technique is not infrequently used as the choice of lexical units may depend, to a large extent, on the syntactic pattern they fit into.

Let us give an illustration. Suppose the original sentence runs as follows: "The computer and the man-made satellite were, by all rules of heredity, conceived in the small Northern towns of England, the seat of the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century."

The general idea is clear. The sentence implies that the Industrial Revolution initiated the technological progress which is today characterized by such outstanding achievements as computers and artificial satellites. The first step will be for the translator to try a parallel structure in Russian:

«Компьютеры и т.д. были созданы (зародились, появились, возникли и пр.) по всем законам наследственности...». It appears that no matter what lexical units are used within the structure, the Russian sentence will somehow imply that modern computers actually were built, invented, or at any rate thought of, in Britain as early as in the 18th century. Now the translator's technique will be to draw up a list of Russian structures used to convey the idea that something which exists today can have its origin traced to much earlier time. He may think of such structures as «X уходит своими корнями в ...», «Y положил начало X», «Здесь находится начало пути, который привел к X», «Здесь были посеяны семена, всходы которых привели к X», etc. Trying to fit the Russian variant into a meaningful whole with the phrase "by all rules of heredity", the translator will probably choose the expression «X ведет свою родословную от Y».

The choice of the structure in translation often calls for a good deal of ingenuity and imagination on the part of the translator. He should be able to make an accurate assessment of the semantic possibilities of the given syntactic structure in order to see whether the latter can be used to convey the original meaning.

Suppose the English sentence is structured with the help of the verb "to add", e.g.: "A new excitement was added to the races at Epsom Downs last year." The problem is to decide whether in Russian it is possible to express this idea in a similar way, that is by saying that a feeling is added to a competition. If the translator finds it unacceptable as being alien to the semantic structure of the Russian language which seems to have less freedom in joining heterogeneous ideas within a syntactic structure, his second problem will be to think of the acceptable Russian way to say "the same thing". Russian would reject "excitement added to the race", but it permits such structures as "the race evoked a new excitement", or "the race was more exciting", or "the race was watched with greater excitement", etc. Thus the translator can make his syntactic choice and then look for appropriate substitutes for "excitement", "race" and other lexical units in the original.

A word of caution may be in order here. In the practical course of translation great pains are usually taken to teach the future translator to replace the original syntactical structures by using appropriate transformations which produce acceptable TL structures without any great loss of information. As a result, some translators get into the habit of turning every original structure inside out syntactically, irrespective of whether it serves any useful purpose.

It should be borne in mind that parallel TL structures are as good as any and they should by no means be avoided or considered inferior. On the contrary, the practical rule that the translator will do well to follow is that he should use the parallel structure whenever possible, and resort to syntactic or semantic transformations only if it is unavoidable.

Thus in all cases the translator makes a choice between a parallel structure and a transformed one in TL. Selecting the transformation to be used in a particular case he draws upon his knowledge of syntactic equivalents and the theory of equivalence.

The choice of the syntactical structure of the translated sentence often depends on the TL co-occurrence rules. The problem of co-occurrence is one with which the translator has not infrequently to come to grips in translating different word combinations, as the rules of combinability in SL and TL do not dovetail. This lack of correspondence limits the freedom of the translator's choice and compels him to employ special techniques to overcome this barrier.

Translations from English into Russian give ample proof of the significance of this difference in co-occurrence. Just try to render into Russian such combinations as "a hopeful voice", "a successful leader", "a cooperative assistance", etc. and you will see that they are easy to understand but cannot be translated "as they are" since the corresponding Russian words do not come together.

Dealing with such problems translators use one of the following methods: they either replace one or both members of the original combination to make possible the same type of structure in translation, or they transfer the dependent member to another structure, or they introduce some additional elements (words) through which the members of the combination can be joined syntactically.

Let us give examples.

Some of these countries have established new constitutions.

In Russian constitutions cannot be established but they can be adopted. Therefore:

Некоторые из этих стран приняли новые конституции, (or: В некоторых из этих стран были приняты новые конституции.)

The AFL leaders have a corrupt alliance with the employers.

Since in Russian the usual correspondence to "corrupt" (продажный) can be applied only to human beings, we can have either «преступный союз» or «преступный сговор» or something like that. But we can also preserve the meaning of "corrupt" by referring its Russian equivalent to another word in the sentence:

Продажные лидеры АФТ вступили в преступный союз с предпринимателями.

The country had sincere and successful leaders. В стране честные руководители, добившиеся значительных успехов.

After all, successful leaders are those who have achieved good successes and the original meaning is fully preserved in the translation, though in a rather long-winded manner.

An additional way to deal with the problem of co-occurrence is through a choice of different parts of speech. "A cooperative assistance" is difficult to translate into Russian where «сотрудничающая помощь» is an unacceptable combination. But if both words were translated as nouns the problem would be solved:

We owe this success to the cooperative assistance of the Ukraine. Мы обязаны этим успехом сотрудничеству и помощи со стороны Украины.

The change in the parts of speech is a common procedure in translation. It often enables the translator to modify his variant to improve its stylistic or emotional effect. So, for "The wind was becoming stronger" the translator has the choice of «Ветер дул все сильнее» and «Ветер крепчал», for "I didn't mean to be rude" he may choose between «Я не хотел быть грубым» and «Я не собирался вам грубить».

Sometimes, the use of a different part of speech is unavoidable: "He was furious" – «Он был в бешенстве»

The elements of the translator's techniques described above give only a general idea of his professional strategy. Translation is a creative process of search and discovery and it takes much ingenuity and effort to apply the general principles of the translation theory to the practical problems.

Suggested Topics for Discussion

1. What are the two main stages of the translating process? Must the translator understand the original text before he begins to produce his text in TL? In what way does the translator's understanding of the source text differ from that by a SL native speaker?

2. What makes understanding possible? Where can the translator find the necessary information of what a segment of the text really means? What is context? What is background knowledge?

3. What role do the semantics of language units play in the make-up of the text semantic structure? In what sense can one speak of "translating" the words or the grammatical categories and structures of the source text? What is the difference between the word "semantics" as defined in the dictionary and its meaning in a particular text?

4. Are all the semantic elements of the source text of equal communicative value? Can they all be always rendered in translation? Why has the translator to adopt a "lesser evil" strategy? How should the dominant aspects of the source text meaning be selected?

5. What parts of the text semantics are usually of greater communicative value? Are the purport of communication and the identification of the situation expressed by individual words and structures or by the whole text? Why is it often more important to render the meaning of the whole than that of each particular item?

6. How can a word-for-word transfer be used in the translating process? Should the syntactical structure of the source text be always changed in translation? How should the TL structures be selected in the target text?

7. What is lexical co-occurrence? Are co-occurrence rules usually the same in SL and TL? What techniques can be used by the translator to solve the problem of the difference in co-occurrence?

8. Does the translation theory dictate strict rules to the translator? What makes translation a creative process? Can the translator automatically apply the theoretical postulates in each particular case?

Text

FAO ... LET THERE BE BREAD

A new excitement has been added to the queer race that Man has run against himself through the ages, testing whether he can produce food I fast enough to feed his fast-growing family. In the past the race has never been a contest. Never, in all the yesterdays since he clambered out of the primeval ooze, has Man the Provider caught up with Man the Procreator: there has been famine somewhere in the world in nearly every year of recorded history. Even today, after twenty centuries of Christian Enlightment, half man's family goes hungry and vast numbers of them are actually starving to death. Nevertheless, the race has suddenly grown close enough to be charged with suspense. For the Provider has latterly been getting expert coaching from the sidelines and, despite the fact that the Procreator is adding to his family at the unprecedented rate of nearly fifty million a year, the gap is steadily closing. The coach responsible for this remarkable turn of events is the Food and Agricultural Organization, more familiarly known as FAO, a specialized Agency of the United Nations. As its name suggests, FAO worries more about the eater than about the farmer. The emphasis is natural enough, for farmers (and fishermen and producers of food generally) comprise only about three-fifths of the world's gainfully employed, but we all eat and, to hear FAO tell it, most of us eat wrong. It was, indeed, out of concern for the well-being of eaters the world over that FAO was born.

Text Analysis

1. How can Man run a race against himself? Does this figure of speech represent Man's efforts to produce enough food as a kind of a sport event? Does the added excitement to the race mean that the struggle between the competitors has become unpredictable and more interesting to watch?

2. How can a race not be a contest? Does a contest imply that each of the participants has a chance to win? that there is no overwhelming superiority of one of them?

3. Did Man really clamber out of the primeval ooze? Does the phrase refer to an actual period in Man's evolution or is it just a figure of speech? If the Provider catches up with the Procreator, does it mean that there will be enough food for the earth's growing population? Is recorded history the same as written history or is it the history we knew something about?

4. In what sense can the last twenty centuries be called the years of Christian Enlightment?

5. Is the distance between the participants in a close race great or small? What is a book full of suspense? How can a race be charged with suspense? Does it mean that it has become more thrilling for the on-lookers?

6. Does "to get expert coaching" mean to get good advice from a coach? Is a coach a man who supervises a sportsman's training? When one runner is gaining on the other, is the gap between them widening or closing?

7. If a man is responsible for something does it always mean that he is guilty of something? What is a UN specialized agency?

8. Is the eater a common name for a food consumer? In what respect can the eater be contrasted to the farmer?

9. Are gainfully employed people those who earn their living by their own efforts? If we say that a person eats wrong, do we refer to his table manners or to the quality of food?

10. How can emphasis be expressed syntactically? What is the meaning of the preposition "out of in combinations with such words as 'love, hate, consideration, affection", etc.? In what sense can an organization be born?

Chapter 1. LEXICAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

1.1. HANDLING CONTEXT-FREE WORDS

Introductory Notes

As a rule, the object of translation is not a list of separate lexical units it a coherent text in which the SL words make up an integral whole. Though each word in the language has its own meaning, the actual information it conveys in a text depends, to a great extent, on its contextual environment. Generally speaking, the meaning of any word in the text cannot be understood and translated without due regard to the specific context in which it is actualized. Some words, however, are less sensitive to the contextual influence than others. There are words with definite meanings which are retained in most contexts and are relatively context-free. Context-tree words are mainly found among proper and geographical names, titles of magazines and newspapers, names of various firms, organizations, ships, aircraft and the like, as well as among technical terms used by experts in all fields of human endeavour.

Context-free words have an important role to play in the translating process. They usually have permanent equivalents in TL which, in most cases, can be used in TT. The translator is thus provided with reference points helping him to choose the appropriate translation variants. The permanent equivalents of context-free words are often formed by transcription (with possible elements of transliteration) or loan translations.

Proper and *geographical names* are transcribed with TL letters, e.g.: Smith – Смит, Brown – Браун, John Fitzgerald Kennedy – Джон Фитцжеральд Кеннеди; Cleveland – Кливленд, Rhode Island – Род-Айленд, Ontario – Онтарио; Downing Street – Даунинг-стрит, Foley Square – Фоли-сквер.

The same is true about *the titles of periodicals* and *the names of firms and corporations*, e.g.: Life – «Лайф», US News and World Report – «ЮС ньюс энд уорлд рипорт», General Motors Corporation – «Дженерал моторс корпорейшн», Harriman and Brothers – «Гарримен энд бразерс», Anaconda Mining Company – «Анаконда майнинг компани».

Transcription is also used to reproduce in TL *the names of ships, aircraft, missiles* and *pieces of military equipment:* Queen Elisabeth – «Куин Елизабет», Spitfire – «Спитфайр», Hawk – «Хок», Trident – «Трай-Дент», Honest John – «Онест Джон».

The rules of transcription have two minor exceptions. First, it is sometimes supplemented by elements of transliteration when SL letters are reproduced in TT instead of sounds. This technique is used with mute and double consonants between vowels or at the end of the word and with neutral vowels (Dorset – Дорсет, Bonners Ferry – Боннерс Ферри) as well as to preserve some elements of SL spelling so as to make the TL equivalent resemble some familiar pattern (the Hercules missile – ракета «Геркулес», Columbia – Колумбия). Second, there are some traditional exceptions in rendering the names of historical personalities and geographical names, e.g.: Charles I – Карл I, James II – Яков П, Edinborough – Эдинбург.

Some geographical names are made up of common nouns and are translated word-for-word: the United States of America – Соединенные Штаты Америки, the United Kingdom – Соединенное Королевство, the Rocky Mountains – Скалистые горы.

If the name includes both a proper name and a common name, the former is transcribed while the latter is either translated or transcribed or both: the Atlantic Ocean – Атлантический океан, Kansas City – Канзас-сити, New Hampshire – Нью-Хемпшир, Firth of Clyde – залив Ферт-оф-Клайд.

Names of political parties, trade unions and *similar bodies* are usually translated word-for-word (with or without a change in the word-order): the Republican Party – республиканская партия, the United Automobile Workers Union – Объединенный профсоюз рабочих автомобильной промышленности, the Federal Bureau of Investigation – Федеральное бюро расследований.

Terminological words are also relatively context-free though the context often helps to identify the specific field to which the term belongs. In the sentence "These rifles are provided with a new type of foresight", the context clearly shows that the meaning of "foresight" is that of a military term and therefore all other meanings of the word can be disregarded. The context may also help to understand the meaning of the term in the text when it can denote more than one specific concept. For instance, in the US political terminology the term "state" can refer either to a national state or to one of the states within a federal entity. The following context will enable the translator to make the correct choice: "Both the state and Federal authorities were accused of establishing a police state."

In the first case the term "state" is contrasted with "Federal" and will be translated as «штат», while in the second case it obviously means «государство».

As a rule, English technical terms (as well as political terms and terms in any other specific field) have their permanent equivalents in the respective Russian terminological systems: magnitude – величина, oxygen – кислород, surplus value – прибавочная стоимость, Embassy – посольство, legislation – законодательство.

Many Russian equivalents have been formed from the English terms by transcription or loan translations: computer – компьютер, electron – электрон, Congressman – конгрессмен, impeachment – импичмент, shadow cabinet – «теневой кабинет», nuclear deterrent – ядерное устрашение. Quite a few among them are international terms: theorem – теорема, television – телевидение, president – президент, declaration – декларация, diplomacy – дипломатия. In some cases there are parallel forms in Russian: one formed by transcription and the other, so to speak, native, e.g.: резистор and сопротивление, бустер and ускоритель, индустрия and промышленность, тред-юнион and профсоюз, лидер and руководитель.

The translator makes his choice considering whether ST is highly technical or not, for a borrowed term is usually more familiar to specialists than to laymen. He has also to take into account the possible differences between the two forms in the way they are used in TL. For example, the Russian «индустрия» is restricted in usage and somewhat old-fashioned, «тред-юнион» always refers to British trade-unions and «лидер» gives the text a slightly foreign flavour.

Dealing with context-free words the translator must be aware of two common causes of translation errors. First, English and Russian terms can be similar in form but different in meaning. A "decade" is not «декада», an "instrument" is not «инструмент», and a "department" in the United States is not «департамент». Such words belong to the so-called false friends of the translator. Second, the translator should not rely on the "inner form" of the English term to understand its meaning or to find a proper Russian equivalent for it is often misleading. A "packing industry" is not «упаковочная» but «консервная промышленность», "conventional armaments" are not «условные» but «обычные вооружения» and a "public school" in Britain is not «публичная» or «общедоступная» but «частная школа».

Translation of technical terms puts a premium on the translator's knowledge of the subject-matter of ST. He must take great pains to get familiar with the system of terms in the appropriate field and make good use of technical dictionaries and other books of reference.

1.2. HANDLING CONTEXT-BOUND WORDS

Introductory Notes

The words dealt with in the previous lecture are relatively independent of the context so that they have a definite meaning which is reproduced in many texts as it stands. This is not the case, however, with most words in the English vocabulary whose meaning in any sentence largely depends on the context in which they are used. True, all words have meanings of their own which are defined in dictionaries but the context may specify or modify the word's meaning, neutralize or emphasize some part of its semantics. And before looking for an equivalent, the translator has to make a careful study of the context to identify the contextual meaning of the word that should be rendered in translation. This meaning is the result of the interaction between the word semantics and the methods of its actualization in the speech act.

Most of the words are *polysemantic*, that is, they have several meanings. As a rule, the word is used in the sentence in one of its meanings and the context must show what meaning has been selected by the speaker and cut off all other meanings irrelevant for the particular act of communication. If somebody complains that "Few Europeans speak Mandarin", the context inequivocally shows that it is the Chinese language that is meant and not a Chinese imperial official or the Chinese fruit. If the same idea is expressed in a more ambiguous way, for instance, "Few Europeans know the first thing about Mandarin", the context of the sentence may fail to indicate the relevant meaning beyond any doubt but the rest of the text or the circumstances of communication will certainly do that.

The context has also a decisive role to play in the selection of TL equivalents to the words of the original. We know that in most cases, the meaning of a SL word can be rendered in TL by a number of regular equivalents. Variable equivalents can be found not only to the polysemantic words but also to *the monosemantic words* as well as to a semantic variant of a polysemantic word, that is, to one of its meanings which can be actualized in the course of communication. In such cases after the translator has ascertained what meaning the word has in the original text he still has to choose one of the regular equivalents which fits the context best of all. In other words, the role of the context is even greater for the translator than for an ordinary SL receptor. Suppose he is to translate the following English sentence "This issue of the paper devoted about half of its twenty news columns to the trial of a murderer". The context enables the translator to understand that the "issue" refers here to a publication, the "paper" is a newspaper and the "column" is a department in that newspaper. But he has also to find additional information in the context which will allow him to choose an equivalent to "issue" among such Russian words as «выпуск, издание, номер» or to compare the use of the Russian «отдел, колонка, столбец» as equivalents to "column".

No less important is the role of the context in translating the words with a wide range of reference whose equivalents are too numerous to be listed in any dictionary. For example, the English noun "record" is defined as "something that records" or "the recorded facts about something or I someone" and can refer to any document or any events, past or present. It is clear that the Russian names of documents or events cannot be foreseen and the translator has to find the appropriate occasional equivalent in each particular context.

The context may modify the meaning of a word to such an extent that its regular equivalents will not fit TT. In the following sentence: "History has dealt with Hitler; history will deal with all would-be Hitlers", the translator has to do with the verb "to deal" used in the sentence in the meaning -which is usually rendered into Russian as «обходиться» or «поступать». But obviously history has dealt with Hitler as severely as he deserved and the translator will opt for a stronger occasional equivalent like «покончить». The ability to render the contextual meanings is an essential element of the translator's professional skill.

The contextual modification may extend to the connotative meaning of the word. The translator is greatly concerned about the adequate reproduction of this part of the word semantics since it has an impact upon the whole text. For example, the English noun "ambition" and the adjective "ambitious" can contextually assume either a positive or a negative connotation. Accordingly, "the UN ambitious program of providing food for the people of the earth" will be translated as «грандиозная программа ООН» while the "ambitious plans of South African racists" will be rendered as «честолюбивые планы южно-африканских расистов».

The English-Russian dictionary is the translator's best friend and asistant in finding the appropriate equivalent. Sometimes the context tells the translator that one of the dictionary equivalents to the given word can be well used in TT. Even if the entry in his dictionary does not provide him with an equivalent that fits his context, the translator can use the dictionary data to facilitate the solution. Suppose he comes across a sentence in ST which runs as follows:

The United States worked out a formula which later came to be known as dollar diplomacy.

None of the equivalents suggested by I.R. Galperin's "New English-Russian Dictionary" (формула, рецепт, догмат, шаблон) fits the context of the sentence which deals with a stage in the US political history. But combining these data with the context the translator will look for a Russian substitute for a "political formula" and may arrive at such terms as «политическая доктрина» or «политическая программа»:

США выработали политическую доктрину, которая впоследствии стала именоваться «долларовой дипломатией».

The translator should consult the context with special care if his dictionary suggests only one equivalent. He should not be in a hurry to use this equivalent in his text without first ascertaining that the English word really is context-free and is always translated in the same way. In case it is not, the entry is not exhaustive and the translator should look for another way out. The "New English-Russian Dictionary", for example, treats the English words "opportunism" and "opportunist" as political terms and gives only one equivalent to each: «оппортунизм» and «оппортунист». An English-English dictionary, however, will define "opportunism" as "the art, policy, or practice of taking advantage of opportunities or circumstances". And when the word is used as a general term of disapprobation implying little regard for principles or consequences, the equivalents suggested by the dictionary have to be rejected in favor of such Russian words as «конъюнктурщик, приспособленец» and the like. This is also an illustration of the usefulness of an English-English dictionary to the translator who should always turn to it for more complete information on the word semantics.

Professional skill in using both the dictionary data and the information extracted from the context to solve his translation problems is the hallmark of a good translator.

1.3. HANDLING EQUIVALENT-LACKING WORDS

Introductory Notes

It has been pointed, out that many English words have no regular equivalents, and a number of techniques has been suggested for rendering the meanings of such equivalent-lacking words in TT. Now the practising translator most often has to resort to such techniques when he comes across some new-coined words in the source text or deals with names of objects or phenomena unknown to the TL community (the so-called "realia").

New words are coined in the language to give names to new objects, or phenomena which become known to the people. This process is going on a considerable scale as shown by the necessity of publishing dictionaries of new words. (See, for example, "The Barnhart Dictionary of New English 1963-1972", London, 1973, with more than 5,000 entries). With the English vocabulary constantly expanding, no dictionary can catch up with the new arrivals and give a more or less complete list of the new words. Moreover there are numerous short-lived lexical units created ad hoc by the English-speaking people in the process of oral or written communication. Such words may never get in common use and will not be registered by the dictionaries but they are well understood by the communicants since they are coined on the familiar structural and semantic models. If someone is ever referred to as a "Polandologist", the meaning will be readily understood against such terms as "Kremlinologist" or "Sovietologist". If a politician is called "a nuclearist", the new coinage will obviously mean a supporter of nuclear arms race. "A zero-growther" would be associated with some zero-growth theory or policy and so on.

When new words come into being to denote new objects or phenomena, they naturally cannot have regular equivalents in another language. Such equivalents may only gradually evolve as the result of extensive contacts between the two nations. Therefore the translator coming across a new coinage has to interpret its meaning and to choose the appropriate way of rendering it in his translation. Consider the following sentence: "In many European capitals central streets have been recently pedestrianized." First, the translator will recognize the origin of "pedestrianize" which is coined from the word "pedestrian" – «пешеход» and the verb-forming suffix *-ize*. Then he will realize the impossibility of a similar formation in Russian (опешеходить!) and will opt for a semantic transformation: «движение транспорта было запрещено», «улицы были закрыты для транспорта» or «улицы были отведены только для пешеходов».

As often as not a whole set of new words may enter in common use, all formed on the same model. Thus, the anti-segregation movement in the United States in the 1960's introduced a number of new terms to name various kinds of public demonstrations formed from a verb + *-in* on the analogy of "sit-in": "ride-in" (in segregated buses), "swim-in" (in segregated swimming pools), "pray-in" (in segregated churches) and many others.

Various translators may select different ways of translating a new coinage, with several substitutes competing with one another. As a rule, one of them becomes more common and begins to be used predominantly. For instance, the new term "word-processor" was translated into Russian as «словообработчик», «словопроцессор» and «текстопроцессор», the last substitute gaining the upper hand. The translator should carefully watch the development of the usage and follow the predominant trend.

Similar problems have to be solved by the translator when he deals with equivalent-lacking words referring to various SL realia. As often as not, the translator tries to transfer the name to TL by way of borrowing, loan word or approximate equivalents. Many English words have been introduced in Russian in this way: «бейсбол» (baseball), «небоскреб» (skyscraper), «саквояжники» (carpet baggers), etc. Quite a number of equivalent-lacking words of this type, however, still have no established substitutes in Russian, and the translator has to look for an occasional equivalent each time he comes across such a word in the source text. Mention can be made here of "filibustering", "baby-sitter", "tinkerer", "know-how", "ladykiller", and many others.

A large group of equivalent-lacking English words includes words of general semantics which may have a great number of substitutes in Russian which cannot be listed or enumerated. These are such words as "approach, control, corporate, pattern, record, facility", etc. Numerous lexical units of this type are created by conversion especially when compound verbs are nominalized. What is "a fix-up" for example? It can refer to anything that is fixed up. And "a set-up" is anything that is set up, literally or figuratively. The translator is expected to understand the general idea conveyed by the word and to see what referent it is denoting in each particular case.

Special attention should be paid to English conjunctions and prepositions which are often used differently from their apparent equivalents in Russian and are, in fact, equivalent-lacking. Such common conjunctions as "when, if, as, once, whichever" and some others are not infrequently the cause of errors in translation and should be most carefully studied.

Similar pitfalls can be set for the translator by such productive English "semi-suffixes" as *-minded, -conscious, -oriented, -manship,* etc.

In conclusion, let us recall that any word may become equivalent-lacking if the particular context makes it impossible to use its regular equivalent and forces the translator to resort to some semantic transformation.

Translating equivalent-lacking words calls for a good deal of ingenuity and imagination on the part of the translator who should be well trained to use the appropriate semantic transformations, whenever necessary. At the same time he must be prepared to look for new ways of solving his problems whenever the standard methods cannot be applied to the particular context.

1.4. HANDLING TRANSLATOR'S FALSE FRIENDS

Introductory Notes

There are words in the source and target languages which are more or less similar in form. Such words are of great interest to the translator since he is naturally inclined to take this formal similarity for the semantic proximity and to regard the words that look alike as permanent equivalents. The formal similarity is usually the result of the two words having the common origin, mainly derived from either Greek or Latin. Since such words can be found in a number of languages, they are referred to as "international".

As a matter of fact, very few international words have the same meanings in different languages. In respect to English and Russian we can cite the words like the English "parliament, theorem, diameter" and their Russian counterparts «парламент, теорема, диаметр». In most cases, however, the semantics of such words in English and in Russian do not coincide and they should rather be named "pseudointemational". Their formal similarity suggesting that they are interchangeable, is, therefore, deceptive and may lead to translation errors. For that reason they are often referred to as the *translator's false friends.*

The pseudointernational words can be classified in two main groups. First, there are words which are similar in form but completely different in meaning. Here the risk of making a bad mistake is very great whenever the translator fails to consult his dictionary. Lots of mistakes have been made translating such English words as "decade, complexion, lunatic, accurate, actual, aspirant" and the like. E.g.:

(1) It lasted the whole decade.

(2) She has a very fine complexion.

(3) Well, he must be a lunatic.

The respective Russian words «декада, комплекция, лунатик» are pseudointemational and cannot be used in translation. Cf.:

(1) Это продолжалось целое десятилетие.

(2) У нее прекрасный цвет лица.

(3) Да он, должно быть, сумасшедший.

Second, there are many pseudointernational words which are not fully interchangeable though there are some common elements in their semantics. They may become the false friends if the translator substitutes one of them for the other without due regard to the difference in their meaning or to the way the English word is used in the particular context. The translator should bear in mind that a number of factors can preclude the possibility of using the formally similar word as an equivalent. Among these factors the following are most important:

1. The ***semantic*** factor resulting from the different subsequent development of the words borrowed by the two languages from the same source. For instance, the English "idiom" can be well rendered by its Russian counterpart to convey the idea of an expression whose meaning cannot be derived from the conjoined meanings of its elements but has developed such additional meanings as dialect (local idiom) and individual style (Shakespeare's idiom). When the word is used in either of these meanings its equivalent in Russian will not be «идиом», but «диалект, наречие» or «стиль», respectively.

As often as not, the translator may opt for an occasional equivalent to a pseudointernational word just as he may do while dealing with any other type of the word:

South Vietnam was a vast laboratory for the testing of weapons of counter-guerrilla warfare.

Южный Вьетнам стал полигоном для испытания оружия, используемого в войне против партизан.

2. The ***stylistic*** factor resulting from the difference in the emotive or stylistic connotation of the correlated words. For example, the English "career" is neutral while the Russian «карьера» is largely negative. The translator has to reject the pseudointernational substitute and to look for another way out, e.g.:

Davy took on Faraday as his assistant and thereby opened a scientific career for him.

Дэви взял Фарадея к себе в ассистенты и тем самым открыл ему путь в науку.

3. The ***co-occurrence*** factor reflecting the difference in the lexical combinability rules in the two languages. The choice of an equivalent is often influenced by the usage preferring a standard combination of words to the formally similar substitute. So, a "defect" has a formal counterpart in the Russian «дефект» but "theoretical and organizational defects" will be rather «теоретические и организационные просчеты». A "gesture" is usually translated as «жест» but the Russian word will not be used to translate the following sentence for the combinability factor:

The reason for including only minor gestures of reforms in the program...

Причина включения в программу лишь жалкого подобия реформ...

4. The **pragmatic** factor reflecting the difference in the background knowledge of the members of the two language communities which makes the translator reject the formal equivalent in favour of the more explicit or familiar variant. The reader of the English

original will usually need no explanation concerning the meaning of such terms as "the American Revolution", "the Reconstruction" or "the Emancipation Proclamation" which refer to the familiar facts of the US history. In the Russian translation, however, these terms are usually not replaced by their pseudointernational equivalents. Instead, use is made of the descriptive terms better known to the Russian reader:

The American Revolution was a close parallel to the wars of national liberation in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Война за независимость в Америке была прямым прототипом национально-освободительных войн в колониальных и полуколониальных странах.

This counter-revolutionary organization was set up to suppress the Negro – poor white alliance that sought to bring democracy in the South in the **Reconstruction period.**

Эта контрреволюционная организация была создана для подавления совместной борьбы негров и белых бедняков, которые добивались установления демократии на юге после **отмены рабства.**

The Senator knew Lincoln's **Emancipation Proclamation** by heart.

Сенатор знал наизусть провозглашенную Линкольном **декларацию об отмене рабства.**

With the knowledge of, and due regard to, these factors, the translator stands a good chance of making the pseudointernational words his good friends and allies.

CHAPTER 2. COLLOCATIONAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION

2.1. HANDLING ATTRIBUTIVE GROUPS

Introductory Notes

It has been mentioned that there is a considerable dissimilarity in the semantic structure of attributive groups in English and in Russian. This dissimilarity gives rise to a number of translation problems.

The first group of problems stems from the broader semantic relationships between the attribute and the noun. As has been pointed out the attribute may refer not only to some property of the object but also to its location, purpose, cause, etc. As a result, the translator has to make a thorough analysis of the context to find out what the meaning of the group is in each particular case. He must be also aware of the relative freedom of bringing together such semantic elements within the attributive group in English that are distanced from each other by a number of intermediate ideas. Thus a resolution submitted by an executive body of an organization may be described as "the Executive resolution" and the majority of votes received by such a resolution will be the Executive majority. If a word-for-word translation of the name of the executive body (e.g. the Executive Committee – исполнительный комитет) may satisfy the translator, the other two attributive groups will have to be explicated in the Russian translation as «резолюция, предложенная исполкомом» and «большинство голосов, поданных за резолюцию, которая была предложена исполкомом», respectively.

The second group of problems results from the difficulties in handling multi-member attributive structures. The English-speaking people make wide use of "multi-storied" structures with complicated internal semantic relationships. The tax paid for the right to take part in the election is described as "the poll tax". The states where this tax is collected are "the poll tax states" and the governors of these states are "the poll tax states governors". Now these governors may hold a conference which will be referred to as "the poll tax states governors conference" and so on.

The semantic relationships within a multi-member group need not be linear. Consider the following sentence:

It was the period of the broad western hemisphere and world pre-war united people's front struggle against fascism.

Here we have a whole network of semantic ties between the attributes and the noun: 'broad" is directly referred to "struggle", "western hemisphere" is joined with "world" and together they express the idea of location, i.e. "the struggle in the western hemisphere"; "pre-war" may be referred either to "struggle" or to the "united people's front"; "united" and "people's" belong to "front" and together they qualify the "struggle" implying either the "struggle by the united people's front" or the "struggle for the united people's front".

In translation this complexity of semantic ties will result in replacing the group by a number of different structures in which the hidden relations within it will be made explicit:

Это был период широкой предвоенной борьбы против фашизма за единый народный фронт в Западном полушарии и во всем мире.

Given the multiplicity of possible translations such structures should be analysed in terms of factors influencing the choice of Russian variants rather than with the aim of listing regular correspondences.

The same goes for attributive groups with latent predication where a whole sentence is used to qualify a noun as its attribute "He was being the boss again, using the its-my-money-now-do-as-you're-told voice". Here correspondences can also be described in an indirect way only by stating that the attribute is usually translated into Russian as a separate sentence and that this sentence should be joined to the noun by a short introductory element. Cf.:

The Judge's face wore his own I-knew-they-were-guilty-all-along expression.

На лице судьи появилось обычное выражение, говорившее: «Я все время знал, что они виновны».

There was a man with a don't-say-anything-to-me-or-I'll-contradict-you face. (Ch. Dickens)

Там был человек, на лице которого было написано: что бы вы мне ни говорили, я все равно буду вам противоречить.

There is one more peculiar feature of the English attributive group which may be the cause of trouble for the translator. It may be transformed into a similar group with the help of a suffix which is formally attached to the noun but is semantically related to the whole group. Thus "a sound sleeper" may be derived from "sound sleep" or the man belonging to the "Fifth column" may be described as "the Fifth columnist". The translator should be aware of the derivation process and should not rack his brains trying to figure out how a sleeper can be sound or in what kind of enumeration this particular columnist is the fifth. Rather, he should consider the meaning of the original groups "sound sleep" and "the Fifth column" and then realise that the added suffix makes the group refer to a person who enjoys this kind of sleep or is one of the subversive elements. As a rule, in the Russian translation the meanings of the original group and of the suffix would be rendered separately, e.g.: человек, обладающий здоровым (крепким) сном (крепко спящий человек), and человек, принадлежащий к пятой колонне (член пятой колонны).

As often as not, translating the meaning of an English attributive group into Russian may involve a complete restructuring of the sentence, e.g.:

To watch it happen, all within two and a half hours, was a thrilling sight.

Нельзя было не восхищаться, наблюдая, как все это происходило на протяжении каких-нибудь двух с половиной часов.

2.2. HANDLING PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Introductory Notes

Phraseological units are figurative set expressions often described as "idioms". Such units have an important role to play in human communication. They produce a considerable expressive effect for, besides conveying information, they appeal to the reader's emotions, his aesthetic perception, his literary and cultural associations. Whenever the author of the source text uses an idiom, it is the translator's duty to try and reproduce it with the utmost fidelity.

Now an idiom's semantics are a complex entity and there are five aspects of its meaning that will influence the translator's choice of an equivalent in the target language. They are the idiom's figurative meaning, its literal sense, its emotive character, stylistic register and national colouring. The figurative meaning is the basic element of the idiom's semantics. Thus "red tape" means bureaucracy, "to kick the bucket" means to die, and "to wash dirty linen in public" means to disclose one's family troubles to outsiders. The figurative meaning is inferred from the literal sense. "Red tape", "to kick the bucket", and "to wash dirty linen in public" also refer, respectively, to a coloured tape, an upset pail and a kind of laundering, though in most cases this aspect is subordinate and serves as a basis for the metaphorical use.

Idioms can be positive, negative or neutral. It is clear that "to kill two birds with one stone" is good, "to find a mare's nest" is a ludicrous mistake while "Rome was not built in a day" is a neutral statement of fact. They can also differ in their stylistic usage: they may be bookish (to show one's true colours) or colloquial (to be a pain in the neck). Besides, an idiom can be nationally coloured, that is include some words which mark it as the product of a certain nation. For instance, "to set the Thames on fire" and "to carry coals to Newcastle" are unmistakably British.

The complex character of the idiom's semantics makes its translation no easy matter. But there are some additional factors which complicate the task of adequate identification, understanding and translation of idioms. First, an idiom can be mistaken for a free word combination, especially if its literal sense is not "exotic" (to have butterflies in one's stomach) but rather trivial (to measure one's length, to let one's hair down). Second, a SL idiom may be identical in form to a TL idiom but have a different figurative meaning. Thus, the English "to lead smb. by the nose" implies a total domination of one person by the other (cf. the Russian «водить за нос») and "to stretch one's legs" means to take a stroll (cf. the Russian «протянуть ноги»). Third, a SL idiom can be wrongly interpreted due to its association with a similar, if not identical TL unit. For instance, "to pull the devil by the tail", that is to be in trouble, may be misunderstood by the translator under the influence of the Russian idioms «держать бога за бороду» or «поймать за хвост жар-птицу». Fourth, a wrong interpretation of a SL idiom may be caused by another SL idiom similar in form and different in meaning. Cf. "to make good time" and "to have a good time". Fifth, a SL idiom may have a broader range of application than its TL counterpart apparently identical in form and meaning. For instance, the English "to get out of hand" is equivalent to the Russian «отбиться от рук» and the latter is often used to translate it:

The children **got out of hand** while their parents were away.

В отсутствии родителей дети совсем **отбились от рук**.

But the English idiom can be used whenever somebody or something gets out of control while the Russian idiom has a more restricted usage:

What caused the meeting **to get out of hand**?

Почему собрание прошло так неорганизованно?

The possibility of misinterpreting an idiom in the source text calls for a great deal of vigilance on the part of the translator.

There are four typical methods to handle a SL idiom in the translating process. First, the translator can make use of a TL idiom which is identical to the SL idiom in all five aspects of its semantics, e.g. "to pull chestnuts out of the fire for smb." – таскать каштаны из огня для кого-либо.

Second, the SL idiom can be translated by a TL idiom which has the same figurative meaning, preserves the same emotive and stylistic characteristics but is based on a different image, that is, has a different literal meaning, e.g. "make hay while the sun shines" – куй железо, пока горячо.

Third, the SL idiom can be translated by reproducing its form word-for-word in TL, e.g. "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." – Люди, живущие в стеклянных домах, не должны бросать камни.

Fourth, instead of translating the SL idiom, the translator may try to explicate its figurative meaning, so as to preserve at least the main element of its semantics.

Selecting the appropriate method of translation the translator should take into account the following considerations:

1. Translating the SL idiom by an identical TL idiom is, obviously, the best way out. However, the list of such direct equivalents is rather limited. The translator has a good chance of finding the appropriate TL idiom if the SL idiom, is, so to speak, international, that is, if it originated in some other language, say Latin or Greek, and was later borrowed by both SL and TL. Cf. the English "Achilles' heel" and the Russian «Ахиллесова пята». Equivalent idioms may be borrowed in more recent periods, too, e.g. "the game is not worth the candle" – игра не стоит свеч (both borrowed from French). Even if the translator has managed to find an equivalent idiom in TL he may not be able to use it in his translation because of a difference in connotation. For example, the English "to save one's skin" can be replaced with the Russian «спасти свою шкуру» when its meaning is negative. But it may also have a positive connotation, which its Russian counterpart has not and then the translator will have to look for another way:

Betty saved Tim's skin by typing his report for him.

Бетти выручила Тима, напечатав за него доклад.

2. Whenever the translator fails to find an identical TL idiom he should start looking for an expression with the same figurative meaning but a different literal meaning. Cf. "to get out of bed on the wrong side" – встать с левой ноги. Here the change in the literal meaning of the idiom does not detract much from its effect. Two additional factors, however, should be taken into consideration. First, here again the translator should take

care to preserve the original emotional or stylistic characteristics. So, the English "Jack of all trades" and the Russian «мастер на все руки» both refer to a person who may turn his hand to anything. However, the Russian idiom should not be used to translate the English one, as they are quite different emotionally. In English "Jack of all trades" is derogatory, for he is "master of none", while the Russian saying implies that the man can do many different things well. Similarly, the English "can the leopard change his spots", which is a literary idiom, should not be translated by the Russian «черного кобеля не отмоешь добела» which is highly colloquial, verging on the vulgar. Second, this method of translation should not be used if the TL idiom is distinctly nationally marked. As a rule the translation is presumed to represent what has been said by the foreign author of ST and he is not expected to use definitely Russian idioms such as, for instance, «ездить в Тулу со своим самоваром».

3. A word-for-word translation of the SL idiom is not possible unless the Russian reader will be able to deduce its figurative meaning. Therefore a calque of the English idiom "a skeleton in the cupboard" will be counterproductive, while "to put the cart before the horse" can be well rendered as «ставить телегу впереди лошади».

4. Obviously an explication cannot reproduce the semantics of the SL idiom in a satisfactory way and should be used only in the absence of a better alternative. Cf. "to cut off with a shilling" and «лишить наследства» or "to dine with Duke Humphrey" and «остаться без обеда».

The translator's memory should be well stocked with SL and TL idioms. Handling idiomatic phrases he will find A. Kunin's "English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary" (M., 1984) of great assistance.

CHAPTER 3. GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION

3.1. HANDLING EQUIVALENT FORMS AND STRUCTURES

Introductory Notes

Every word in the text is used in a particular grammatical form and all the words are arranged in sentences in a particular syntactic order. Grammaticality is an important feature of speech units. Grammatical forms and structures, however, do not only provide for the correct arrangement of words in the text, they also convey some information which is part of its total contents. They reveal the semantic relationships between the words, clauses and sentences in the text, they can make prominent some .part of the contents that is of particular significance for the communicants. The syntactic structuring of the text is an important characteristics identifying either the genre of the text or its author's style.

Though the bulk of the information in the original text is conveyed by its lexical elements, the semantic role of grammatical forms and structures should not be overlooked by the translator. The importance of the grammatical aspects of the source text is often reflected in the choice of the parallel forms and structures in TL, as in the following example:

The Industrial Revolution brought into being the industrial proletariat and with it the fight for civil and political rights, trade union organization and the right to vote.

Промышленная революция вызвала к жизни промышленный пролетариат и вместе с ним борьбу за гражданские и политические права, тред-юнионы и право голоса.

In many cases, however, equivalence in translation can be best achieved if the translator does not try to mirror the grammatical forms in the source text. There are no permanent grammatical equivalents and the translator can choose between the parallel forms and various grammatical transformations. He may opt for the latter for there is never an absolute identity between the meaning and usage of the parallel forms in SL and TL. For instance, both English and Russian verbs have their infinitive forms. The analogy, however, does not preclude a number of formal and functional differences. We may recall that the English infinitive has perfect forms, both active and passive, indefinite and continuous, which are absent in the respective grammatical category in Russian. The idea of priority or non-performed action expressed by the Perfect Infinitive is not present in the meaning of the Russian Infinitive and has to be rendered in translation by some other means. Cf. "The train seems to arrive at 5." – Поезд, видимо, приходит в 5. and "The train seems to have arrived at 5." – Поезд, видимо, пришел в 5.

A dissimilarity of the English and Russian Infinitives can be also found in the functions they perform in the sentence. Note should be taken, for example, of the Continuative Infinitive which in English denotes an action following that indicated by the Predicate:

Parliament was dissolved, **not to meet** again for eleven years. Парламент был распущен и не созывался в течение 11 лет. He came home **to find** his wife gone. Он вернулся домой **и обнаружил,** что жена ушла.

A similar difference can be observed if one compares the finite forms of the verb in English and in Russian. The English and the Russian verbs both have active and passive forms, but in English the passive forms are more numerous and are more often used. As a result, the meaning of the passive verb in the source text is often rendered by an active verb in the translation:

This port **can be entered** by big ships only during the tide. Большие корабли могут заходить в этот порт только во время прилива. (The sentence can certainly be translated in some other way, e.g. Этот порт доступен для больших кораблей только во время прилива.)

A most common example of dissimilarity between the parallel syntactic devices in the two languages is the role of the word order in English and in Russian. Both languages use a "direct" and an "inverted" word order. But the English word order obeys, in most cases, the established rule of sequence: the predicate is preceded by the subject and followed by the object. This order of words is often changed in the Russian translation since in Russian the word order is used to show the communicative load of different parts of the sentence, the elements conveying new information (the rheme) leaning towards the end of non-emphatic sentences. Thus if the English sentence "My son entered the room" is intended to inform us who entered the room, its Russian equivalent will be «В комнату вошел мой сын» but in case its purpose is to tell us what my son did, the word order will be preserved: «Мой сын вошел в комнату».

The predominantly fixed word order in the English sentence means that each case of its inversion (placing the object before the subject-predicate sequence) makes the object carry a great communicative load. This emphasis cannot be reproduced in translation by such a common device as the inverted word order in the Russian sentence and the translator has to use some additional words to express the same idea:

Money he had none. Денег у него не было **ни гроша.**

The refusal to use a parallel structure in the target text may involve a change in the number of independent sentences by using the partitioning or the integrating procedures described above. Here is another example of such translations:

The two boys flew on and on towards the village speechless with horror.

Мальчики бежали вперед и вперед по направлению к деревне. Они онемели от ужаса.

It should be noted that a parallel form may prove unsuitable because of its different stylistic connotation. For instance, both English and Russian conditional clauses can be introduced by conjunctions or asyndetically. But the English asyndetical form is bookish while its Russian counterpart is predominantly colloquial. As a result, it is usually replaced in the target text by a clause with a conjunction, e.g.:

Had the Security Council adopted the Ukrainian proposal, it would have been an important step towards the solution of the problem.

Если бы Совет Безопасности принял украинское предложение, это было бы важным шагом к решению проблемы.

The translator usually finds it possible to make a relatively free choice among the possible grammatical arrangements of TT, provided the basic relationships expressed by the SL grammatical categories are intact.

3.2. HANDLING EQUIVALENT-LACKING FORMS AND STRUCTURES

Introductory Notes

It has been mentioned that the source language may have a number of grammatical forms and structures which have no analogues in the target language, and some procedures were suggested for dealing with such equivalent-lacking elements.

The English grammatical form that has no direct equivalent in Russian may be a part of speech, a category within a part of speech or a syntactical structure. A lack of equivalence in the English and Russian systems of parts of speech can be exemplified by the article which is part of the English grammar and is absent in Russian. As a rule, English articles are not translated into Russian for their meaning is expressed by various contextual elements and needn't be reproduced separately. Translating the phrase "the man who gave me the book" with the Russian «человек, который дал мне книгу» the translator needn't worry about the definite article since the situation is definite enough due to the presence of the limiting attributive clause. There are some cases, however, when the meaning of the article has an important role to play in the communication and should by all means be reproduced in TT. Consider the following linguistic statement: 'To put it in terms of linguistics: a sentence is a concrete fact, the result of an actual act of speech. The sentence is an abstraction. So a sentence is always a unit of speech; the sentence of a definite language is an element of that language." It is obvious that an entity cannot be both a concrete fact and an abstraction. The difference between "a sentence" (любое отдельное предложение) and "the sentence" (предложение как понятие, тип предложения) should be definitely revealed in the Russian translation as well.

Even if some grammatical category is present both in SL and in TL, its subcategories may not be the same and, hence, equivalent-lacking. Both the English and the Russian verb have their aspect forms but there are no equivalent relationships between them. Generally speaking, the Continuous forms correspond to the Russian imperfective aspect, while the Perfect forms are often equivalent to the perfective aspect. However, there are many dissimilarities. Much depends on the verb semantics. The Present Perfect forms of non-terminative verbs, for instance, usually correspond to the Russian imperfective verbs in the present tense:

I have lived in Moscow since 1940. **Я живу** в Москве с 1940 г.

Progressive organizations and leaders **have been persecuted**. Прогрессивные организации и передовые деятели **подвергаются преследованиям.**

The Past Indefinite forms may correspond either to the perfective or to the imperfective Russian forms and the choice is largely prompted by the context. Cf.:

After supper he usually **smoked** in the garden. После ужина он обычно курил в саду.

After supper he **smoked** a cigarette in the garden and went to bed. После ужина он выкурил в саду сигарету и пошел спать.

The Past Perfect forms may also be indifferent to these aspective nuances, referring to an action prior to some other action or a past moment. Cf.:

I hoped he **had read** that book.

(а) Я надеялся, что он **читал** эту книгу, (б) Я надеялся, что он (уже) **прочитал** эту книгу.

And, again, the broader context will enable the translator to make the correct choice.

Of particular interest to the translator are the English syntactical (infinitival, participial or gerundial) complexes which have no parallels in Russian. Translating sentences with such complexes always involves some kind of restructuring.

A special study should be made of the translation problems involved in handling the Absolute Participle constructions. To begin with, an Absolute construction must be correctly identified by the translator. The identification problem is particularly complicated in the case of the "with"-structures which may coincide in form with the simple prepositional groups. The phrase "How can you play with your brother lying sick in bed" can be understood in two different ways: as an Absolute construction and then its Russian equivalent will be «Как тебе не стыдно играть, когда твой брат лежит больной (в постели)» or as a prepositional group which should be translated as «Как тебе не стыдно играть с твоим больным братом».

Then the translator should consider the pros and cons of the possible translation equivalents. The meaning of the Absolute Participle construction can be rendered into Russian with the help of a clause, an adverbial participle (деепричастие) or a separate sentence. Each of these methods has its advantages and disadvantages. Using a clause involves the identification of the specific adverbial function of the construction: "Business disposed of, we went for a walk." – Когда (так как) с делом было покончено, мы отправились погулять. This can be avoided by using an adverbial participle, but then care should be taken to refer it to the subject: Покончив с делом, мы отправились погулять. (Dangling participles are common in English but are usually not used in literary Russian. Cf.: "But coming from West Indies, his chances were very slim" and «Подъезжая к станции, у меня слетела шляпа».)

The same sentence can be rendered into Russian by two separate sentences: Работа была закончена. Мы отправились погулять. This method is not infrequently used by the translators, whenever it suits the style of the narration.

Specific translation problems emerge when the translator has to handle a syntactical complex with a causative meaning introduced by the verb "to have" or "to get", such as: "I shall have him do it" or "I shall have him punished". First, the translator has to decide what Russian causative verb should be used as a substitute for the English "have" or "get". Depending on the respective status of the persons involved, the phrase "I shall have him do it" may be rendered into Russian as «Я заставлю его (прикажу ему, велю ему, попрошу его и т.п.) сделать это» or even «Я добьюсь (позабочусь о том, устрою так и т.п.), чтобы он это сделал». Second, the translator must be aware that such complexes are polysemantic and may be either causative or non-causative. The phrase "The general had his horse killed" may refer to two different situations. Either the horse was killed by the general's order (Генерал приказал убить свою лошадь) or he was killed in combat and the general was not the initiator of the act but the sufferer (Под ним убили лошадь). An error in the translator's judgement will result in a distorted translation variant.

Many equivalent-lacking structures result from a non-causative verb used in the typical causative complex. Preserving its basic meaning the verb acquires an additional causative sense. Cf.:

They laughed merrily. Они весело смеялись.

They laughed him out of the room. Они так смеялись над ним, что он убежал из комнаты.

In such cases the translator has to choose among different ways of expressing causative relationships in TL. Cf.:

The US Administration wanted **to frighten** the people **into accepting** the militarization of the country.

Администрация США стремилась запугать народ, чтобы за**ставить** его согласиться на милитаризацию страны.

He **talked** me **into** joining him. Он **уговорил** меня присоединиться к нему.

It should be noted that such English structures are usually formed with the prepositions "into" and "out of" as in the above examples.

3.3. HANDLING MODAL FORMS

Introductory Notes

Modality is a semantic category indicating the degree of factuality that the speaker ascribes to his message. A message can be presented by its author as a statement of facts, a request or an order, or something that is obligatory, possible or probable but not an established fact. Modal relationships make up an important part of the information conveyed in the message. There is a world of difference between asserting that something is and suggesting that it should be or might be.

Obviously a translation cannot be correct unless it has the same modality as the source text. The translator must be able to understand various modal relationships expressed by different means in SL and to choose the appropriate means in TL.

English makes use of three main types of language units to express modal relationships: modal verbs, modal words and word groups, and mood forms.

Modal verbs are widely used in English to express various kinds of modality. The translator should be aware of the fact that an English modal verb can be found in some phrases the Russian equivalents of which have no particular modal forms. Compare the following sentences with their Russian translations:

She can speak and write English. Она говорит и пишет по-английски.

I can see the English coast already. Я уже вижу берег Англии.

Why should you say it? Почему ты так говоришь?

There is no direct correspondence between the English and the Russian modal verbs and the translator should choose the appropriate word which fits the particular context. The meaning of the verb "should", for example, in the sentence "You **should** go and see him" may be rendered in various circumstances by one of the Russian verbs expressing obligation: (a) Вы **должны** навестить его. (b) Вам **необходимо** навестить его. (c) Вам **следует** навестить его. (d) Вам **следовало бы** навестить его, and so on. For the same reason the modal meaning expressed by the confrontation of the two modal verbs in the English original may be rendered into Russian not by two modal verbs but by some other modal forms:

Were you really in earnest when you said that you **could** love a man of lowly position? – Indeed I was. But I said "might".

– Вы на самом деле не шутили, когда сказали, что **могли бы** полюбить человека небогатого? – Конечно нет. Но ведь я сказала **«может быть, смогла бы».**

"It may rain today," he said. His companion looked at the sky. "Well, it **might**," she said.

– Сегодня **может быть** дождь, – сказал он. Его спутница подняла голову и посмотрела на небо. – **Вряд ли,** — ответила она.

Most English modal verbs are polysemantic. So "must" can express obligation or a high degree of probability. "May" implies either probability or moral possibility (permission). "Can" denotes physical or moral possibility, etc. Compare the following sentences with their Russian translations:

You **must** go there at once.
Вы **должны** тотчас же пойти туда.
You must be very tired.
Вы, **должно быть**, очень устали.
He **may** know what has happened.
Может быть, он знает, что произошло.
He **may** come in now.
Теперь он **может** (ему можно) войти.
I **cannot** do the work alone.
Я **не могу** (не в состоянии) один сделать эту работу.
I **cannot** leave the child alone.
Я **не могу** (мне нельзя) оставить ребенка одного.

But when a modal verb is used with a Perfect Infinitive form, it loses, as a rule, its polysemantic character. Thus, "must have been" always implies certainty, "may have been", probability, while "can't have been", improbability. It should also be noted that the Perfect Infinitive may indicate either a prior action (after "must", "may", "cannot") or an action that has not taken place (after "should", "ought to", "could", "to be to"). Cf.:

He **must have told** her about it yesterday. **Должно быть**, он **сказал** ей об этом вчера.

He **should have told** her about it yesterday. Он **должен был** (ему следовало) **сказать** ей об этом вчера.

Special attention should be given to the form "might have been" where the Perfect Infinitive can have three different meanings: a prior action, an action that has not taken place and an imaginable action. Cf.:

I **might have spoken** too strongly. **Возможно, я был** слишком резок.

You **might have done** it yourself.

Вы **могли бы** это сделать сами.

To hear him tell his stories he **might have won** the war alone.

Если послушать его рассказы, **можно подумать**, что он один **выиграл** войну.

Among other means of expressing modality mention should be made of parenthetical modal words: "certainly", "apparently", "presumably", "allegedly", "surely", "of course", "in fact", "indeed", "reportedly" and the like, as well as similar predicative structures: "it is reported", "it is presumed", "it is alleged", etc. They may all express various shades of modal relationships and the translator cannot be too careful in selecting the appropriate Russian equivalents. For instance, "indeed" may be rendered as «более того, поистине, фактически» и т.п., "in fact" – «на самом деле, более того, словом» и т.п., "above all" – «прежде всего, более всего, главным образом».

He was never a useful assistant to me. **Indeed,** he was rather a nuisance.

Он никогда не был мне хорошим помощником. **Более того**, он скорее даже мне мешал.

Some of the modal adverbs ("surely", "easily", "happily" and the like) have non-modal homonyms. Compare:

What should he do if she failed him? Surely die of disappointment and despair.

Что с ним будет, если она его обманет? – **Несомненно**, он умрет от разочарования и отчаяния. (Here "surely" is a modal word.)

Slowly, **surely** as a magnet draws he was being drawn to the shore.

Медленно **и верно,** как будто магнитом, его тянуло к берегу.

The English mood forms give relatively little trouble to the translator since he can, as a rule, make use of the similar moods in Russian. Note should be taken, however, of those forms of the English Subjunctive (the Conjunctive) which are purely structural and express no modal meanings that should be reproduced in translation:

It is important that everyone should do his duty. Важно, чтобы каждый выполнил свой долг. I suggest that we all should go home. Я предлагаю всем пойти домой!

While handling modal forms the translator should not forget that while the English language has practically no modal particles, the Russian language has. Whenever necessary, Russian particles (ведь, хоть, мол, де, дескать и др.) should be used to express modality which is expressed in the source text by other means or only implied:

After us the deluge.

После нас **хоть** потоп.

He was in wild spirits, shouting that you might dissuade him for twenty-four hours.

Он пришел в неистовство и кричал, что вы можете его разубеждать **хоть** круглые сутки.

CHAPTER 4. STYLISTIC ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION

4.1. HANDLING STYLISTICALLY-MARKED LANGUAGE UNITS

Introductory Notes

In different communicative situations the language users select words of different stylistic status. There are stylistically neutral words that are suitable for any situation, and there are literary (bookish) words and colloquial words which satisfy the demands of official, poetic messages and unofficial everyday communication respectively. SL and TL words of similar semantics may have either identical (a steed – скакун, aforesaid – вышеозначенный, gluttony – обжорство, to funk – трусить) or dissimilar (slumber – сон, morn – утро, to swop – менять) stylistic connotation. The translator tries to preserve the stylistic status of the original text, by using the equivalents of the same style or, failing that, opting for stylistically neutral units.

The principal stylistic effect of the text is created, however, with the help of special stylistic devices as well as by the interworking of the meanings of the words in a particular context. The speaker may qualify every object he mentions in his own way thus giving his utterance a specific stylistic turn. Such stylistic phrasing give much trouble to the translator since their meaning is often subjective and elusive. Some phrases become fixed through repeated use and they may have permanent equivalents in TL, e.g. true love – истинная любовь, dead silence – мертвая тишина, good old England – добрая старая Англия. In most cases, however, the translator has to look for an occasional substitute, which often requires an in-depth study of the broad context. When, for example, J. Galsworthy in his "Forsyte Saga" refers to Irene as "that tender passive being, who would not stir a step for herself", the translator is faced with the problem of rendering the word "passive" into Russian so that its substitute would fit the character of that lady and all the circumstances of her life described in the novel.

A common occurrence in English texts is the transferred qualifier syntactically joined to a word to which it does not belong logically. Thus the English speaker may mention "a corrupt alliance", "a sleepless bed" or "a thoughtful pipe". As often as not, such combinations will be thought of as too bizarre in Russian or alien to the type of the text and the qualifier will have to be used with the name of the object it refers to. "The sound of the solemn bells" will become «торжественное звучание колоколов» and "the smiling attention of the stranger" will be translated as «внимание улыбающегося незнакомца».

Note should also be taken of the inverted qualifier which syntactically is not the defining but the defined element. Such a qualifier precedes the qualified word which is joined to it by the preposition "of ": "this devil of a woman", "the giant of a man", etc. The phrase can be transformed to obtain an ordinary combination (a devilish woman, a gigantic man) and then translated into Russian. The translation may involve an additional element: the devil of a woman – чертовски хитрая (умная, неотразимая и т.п.) женщина.

Stylistically-marked units may also be certain types of collocations. Idiomatic phrases discussed above may be cited as an example. Another common type includes conventional indirect names of various objects or "paraphrases". A frequent use of paraphrases is a characteristic feature of the English language.

Some of the paraphrases are borrowed from such classical sources as mythology or the Bible and usually have permanent equivalents in Russian (cf. Attic salt – аттическая соль, the three sisters – богини судьбы, the Prince of Darkness – принц тьмы). Others are purely English and are either transcribed or explained in translation: John Bull – Джон Буль, the three R's – чтение, письмо и арифметика, the Iron Duke – герцог Веллингтон.

A special group of paraphrases are the names of countries, states and other geographical or political entities: the Land of Cakes (Scotland), the Badger State (Wisconsin), the Empire City (New York). As a rule, such paraphrases are not known to the Russian reader and they are replaced by official names in the translation. (A notable exception is "the eternal city" – вечный город.)

Complicated translation problems are caused by ST containing substandard language units used to produce a stylistic effect. The ST author may imitate his character's speech by means of dialectal or contaminated forms. SL territorial dialects cannot be reproduced in TT, nor can they be replaced by TL dialectal forms. It would be inappropriate if a black American or a London cockney spoke in the Russian translation in the dialect, say, of the Northern regions of the USSR. Fortunately, the English dialectal forms are mostly an indication of the speaker's low social or educational status, and they can be rendered into Russian by a judicial employment of low-colloquial elements, e.g.:

He do look quiet, don't 'e? D'e know 'oo 'e is. Sir?

Вид-то у него спокойный, правда? Часом не знаете, сэр, кто он будет?

Here the function of the grammatical and phonetical markers in the English sentence which serve to show that the speaker is uneducated, is fulfilled by the Russian colloquialisms «часом» and «кто он будет».

Contaminated forms are used to imitate the speech of a foreigner. Sometimes, both SL and TL have developed accepted forms of representing the contaminated speech by persons of foreign origin. For example, the speech of a Chinese can be represented in English and in Russian in a conventional way, which facilitates the translator's task:

Me blingee beer. Now you pay. Моя плинесла пиво, твоя типель платить.

If no such tradition exists, the translator has to select some possible contaminated Russian forms to produce the desired effect, e.g.:

When you see him quid' then you quick see him 'perm whale (the speech of a Kanaka).

Когда твоя видел спрут, тогда твоя скоро-скоро видел кашалот.

4.2. HANDLING STYLISTIC DEVICES

Introductory Notes

To enhance the communicative effect of his message the author of the source text may make use of various stylistic devices, such as metaphors, similes, puns and so on. Coming across a stylistic device the translator has to make up his mind whether it should be preserved in his translation or left out and compensated for at some other place.

Metaphors and similes though most commonly used in works of fiction, are not excluded from all other types of texts. A metaphor and a simile both assert the resemblance between two objects or processes but in the latter the similarity is made explicit with the help of prepositions "as" and "like".

Many metaphors and similes are conventional figures of speech regularly used by the members of the language community. Such figurative units may be regarded as idioms and translated in a similar way. As in the case of idioms their Russian equivalents may be based on the same image (a powder magazine – пороховой погреб, white as snow – белый как снег) or on a different one (a ray of hope – проблеск надежды, thin as a rake – худой как щепка). Similarly, some of the English standard metaphors and similes are rendered into Russian word for word (as busy as a bee – трудолюбивый как пчела), while the meaning of others can only be explained in a non-figurative way (as large as life – в натуральную величину).

More complicated is the problem of translating individual figures of speech created by the imagination of the ST author. They are important elements of the author's style and are usually translated word for word. Nevertheless the original image may prove inacceptable in the target language and the translator will have to look for a suitable occasional substitute. Consider the following example:

They had reached the mysterious mill where the red tape was spun, and Yates was determined to cut through it here and now. (St. Heym. "Crusaders")

"Red tape" is usually translated as «бюрократизм, волокита», but bureaucratism cannot be spun or cut through. The translator had to invent an occasional substitute:

Они уперлись в стену штабной бюрократии, но Йейтс твердо решил тут же пробить эту стену.

A similar tactics is resorted to by the translator when he comes across a pun in ST. If the SL word played upon in ST has a Russian substitute which can also be used both literally and figuratively, a word-for-word translation is possible:

Whenever a young gentleman **was taken in hand** by Doctor Blimber, he might consider himself sure of a pretty tight squeeze.

Когда доктор Блаймбер **брал в руки** какого-нибудь джентльмена, тот мог быть уверен, что его как следует стиснут.

In other cases the translator tries to find in TL another word that can be played upon in a similar way:

He says he'll **teach** you to take his boards and make a raft of them; but seeing that you know how to do this pretty well already, the offer... seems a superfluous one on Ms part.

Here the word "teach" is intended by the owner of the boards to mean "to punish" but the man on the raft prefers to understand it in the direct sense. The Russian equivalent «учить» does not mean "to punish" and the translator finds another word which has the two required meanings:

Он кричит, что **покажет** вам, как брать без спроса доски и делать из них плот, но поскольку вы и так прекрасно знаете, как это делать, это предложение кажется вам излишним.

A very popular stylistic device is to include in the text an overt or covert quotation. Unlike references in scientific papers the stylistic effect is usually achieved not by citing a complete extract from some other source, giving the exact chapter and verse and taking great care to avoid even the slightest change in the original wording. In literary or publicist texts quotations often take the form of allusions with a premium put on a general impression. It is presumed that the cited words are well known to the reader and can readily suggest the sought-for associations.

Translation of such allusions is no easy matter. The translator has to identify the source and the associations it evokes with the SL receptors and then to decide whether the source is also known to the TL receptors and can produce the similar effect. He may find the allusion untranslatable even if the source is sufficiently popular. For instance L. Carroll's "Alice in Wonderland" was many times translated into Russian and is much enjoyed both by children and adults in this country. However, the translator will hardly preserve the obvious allusion to the book in the following sentence:

The Tories were accused in the House of Commons yesterday of "living in an Alice in Wonderland world" on the question of nuclear arms for Germany.

Вчера в палате общин консерваторов обвинили в том, что они питают призрачные иллюзии по поводу ядерного вооружения ФРГ.

As a rule, previous translations of the source of the allusion are widely used to render it into Russian. This can be exemplified by S. Marshak's translation of the popular English nursery rhyme about Humpty Dumpty which is often cited in Britain and USA. In the translation Humpty Dumpty who "sat on the wall and had a great fall" was called «Шалтай-Болтай» and "all the king's men" who "cannot put Humpty Dumpty together again" became «вся королевская рать». And ever since all allusions to the rhyme have been translated on the basis of Marshak's version. So, when C. Bernstein and B. Woodward called their famous Watergate story "All the President's Men", it was unquestionably rendered into Russian as «вся президентская рать».

Some stylistic devices may be ignored by the translator when their expressive effect is insignificant and their reproduction in the target text would run counter to the spirit of TL. One of the oldest and most commonly used stylistic devices in English is alliteration. Many headings, strings of epithets and other phrases in English texts consist of words which begin with the same letter. An Englishman seems to be very happy if he can call an artificial satellite "a man-made moon" or invent a headline like "Bar Barbarism in Bars". As a rule, the formal device cannot be reproduced in the Russian translation where it would look rather bizarre and often distort the meaning of the phrase. There are, however, infrequent exceptions when the repetition of the initial letters assumes a particular communicative value. A much cited example is from Ch. Dickens "Little Dorrit":

"Papa is a preferable mode of address," observed Mrs. General. "Father is rather vulgar, my dear. The word Papa, besides, gives a pretty form to the lips. Papa, potatoes, poultry, prunes and prism, are all very good words for the lips, especially prunes and prism."

Obviously the Russian equivalents to the "good" words should all begin with the letter «п» even if they referred to quite different objects, e.g.: папа, пряник, персик, просьба, призма, etc.

Still more infrequent is the reproduction in translation, of another common English stylistic device, the so-called zeugma, when a word enters in several collocations within one sentence each time in a different sense, e.g.:

(The man) ... **took** a final **photograph** of Michael in front of the hut, **two cups of tea** at the Manor, and **his departure.**

In Russian such usage is outside the literary norm (cf. Шли три студента: один – в кино, другой – в сером костюме, а третий – в хорошем настроении).

A stylistic effect can be achieved by various types of repetitions, i.e. recurrence of the word, word combination, phrase for two times or more. A particular type of repetition is the reiteration of several successive sentences (or clauses) which usually includes some type of lexical repetition too, e.g.:

England is a paradise for the well-to-do, a purgatory for the able, and a hell for the poor.

Англия – рай для богачей, чистилище для талантливых и ад для бедняков.

Repetition is a powerful means of emphasis. It adds rhythm and balance to the utterance. In most cases the translator takes pains to reproduce it in TT. Repetition, however, is more often used in English than in Russian and the translator may opt for only a partial reproduction of the English long series of identical language units.